Enlightenment

Illumination



Dialectics of Authenticity

Douglas H. Plumb, 2025

This book was written *without* the aid of artificial intelligence.

Dialectics Of Authenticity

© Douglas H. Plumb, 2025

re-edited Jan 2026

You may bind, sell or distribute this book in any way you choose. I can't receive a payment because I'm debanked, here in Canada, where I live. I wouldn't want to be one to stand in the way of anyone making a buck, and I want to be read. You may not change or add to the contents but you can add a concluding essay. You may not take ownership of the book.

The book is not posted on normal commercial book sites (no bank account) and depends on you to spread the word.

Google will hide this book but it can be found using Yandex and it will be posted on various archives, such as archive.org

My Channels: @dougplumb (archive.org)
@plumb_doug (Twitter)
@DouglasHPlumb (YouTube)
Doug Plumb (Facebook)
dougplumb123@gmail.com

The book will be posted at various other free sites.

"I'm the king of the night time world
And you're my headline queen
I'm the king of the nighttime world,
Come live your secret dreams"
Kiss "Destroyer" Album

"The empty-handed painter from your streets
Is drawing crazy patterns on your sheets."
Bob Dylan "It's All Over Now, Baby Blue"

“In my thoughts I have seen rings of smoke through the trees
And the voices of those who stand looking

Ooh, it makes me wonder
Ooh, really makes me wonder

And it's whispered that soon if we all call the tune
Then the piper will lead us to reason

And a new day will dawn for those who stand long
And the forests will echo with laughter

Oh-oh-oh-oh-whoa

If there's a bustle in your hedgerow, don't be alarmed now
It's just a spring clean for the May queen
Yes, there are two paths you can go by,

but in the long run
There's still time to change the road you're on

And it makes me wonder
Ohh, whoa

Your head is humming, and it won't go,

in case you don't know
The piper's calling you to join him

Dear lady, can you hear the wind blow?

And did you know
Your stairway lies on the whispering wind?”

Led Zeppelin “Stairway To Heaven”

CONTENTS

About The Author....……....6
Preface……...……9

PART 1

Ch 1. Brief History of Thought……14
Plato, Aristotle, Christ, Augustine & Kant
Ch 2. Christianity & The West……20

PART 2

Ch 3. Authenticity of Space and Time (World of objects)…….30
Kant's Critique Of Pure Reason
Ch 4. Authenticity of Self ("I" – self)…….……42
Kant's Critique of Pure Practical Reason
Ch 5. Authenticity of Aesthetics ("Purpose" – nature)……64
Kant's Critique of Teleological Judgment

PART 3

Ch 6. Authenticity.....……...……82
Closing thoughts & Observations

Appendix 1. Glitches in the Time Space Continuum……....93
Gabriel's Horn
Two Capacitor Paradox

Appendix 2. Objections of Kant's Critique Of Pure Reason……xx

Kant As Idealist

Phenomenon / Noumenon Distinction

Appendix 3. Evolution As Regulative & Constitutive……..xx

Darwin's Evolution

Popular Evolution

Appendix 4. Noahide Laws……xx

About the Author

I'm just an ordinary person, and graduated electrical engineering degree, just barely, from a school that you have never heard of in 1996. The political correctness of the "universities" made me realize I would be slowly driven nuts if I stayed and pursued a career in academia. I wondered how they could call these places "universities" but wasn't sure what was wrong.

I went into the real world and made a great career, much better than I had ever expected, I had unique talents that operated synergistically, but between the years of around 1999 and 2001 several life changing events altered my perception, two deep personal betrayals, then a betrayal from our "legal" system, severe hypothyroidism, the realization that our money was fake, and then that most people around me were completely disconnected from reality and had no interest in being connected to reality, all within about two years time.

My mind was playing tricks on me, I was experiencing cognitive dissonance by ignoring a reality that had been there all along. It's the kind of thing that makes you step back and re-evaluate everything. I quit my job, and started all over again, with new values, new friends, and new hopes, dreams and aspirations.

I saw the plane we were all on was headed for a cliff and that the pilot was intentionally steering the plane into a cliff. Trying to understand why became my life's purpose. I had copyright money coming in, enough to support my very modest lifestyle, which I still considered to be far better than a king would have imagined just one hundred years ago. He would have destroyed empires just to be able to ride my bicycle, have hot and cold running water or be able to listen to music or watch theater any time he felt like it.

We could live in a heaven on earth compared to any other time in history, but somehow, we have chosen wars, genocides, famine, and the great lies of history that justify them.

So I began to read, starting at the beginning, Plato and read all the way up to an including Kant. I read some interesting things on this journey, but nothing came close to what I learned from Kant. I've been studying Kant for

ten years, I have a three foot long bookshelf filled with Kant's works and Kantian commentary, all filled with my little notes in the margins.

Most people like myself were conducting their inquiry along historical lines, there are few rationalists left. I'm by nature a rationalist and I think I need a time machine to learn truth in history. I noticed the lack of rational thought that people were engaged in when talking history, so I decided to go down the rationalist path. I have learned much that is not well known in conspiracy theorist based groups and commentators. Many popular commentators could learn lots from this book and it would be an indirect help with their historical inquiries, just as a little knowledge of history has helped me.

I had come to realize that Kant's philosophy is more relevant to today than it was to the times in which Kant lived, through the very early 1700's and into early 1800's, in a city, Königsberg, in Prussia at the same time as the German Enlightenment. I will make the case that Kant is the most relevant philosopher for these particular times and issues that we face – issues of technology and the possibilities of artificial intelligence, as well as new forms of government and law.

So how do we get control of the stick again? A good society comprises men of wisdom, courage, temperance, and justice. No society will ever get more than it deserves. If we want to really understand what is wrong, we need mirrors and we need to return to operating according to an authentic human spirit.

This book is my contribution to the spreading, but not development, of wisdom. I'm not writing this book to explain my own ideas. Most new ideas are just stupid, and that includes my own.

I did have some talent in tutoring math for engineers, which makes me think I have some talent for explaining complex ideas. I'm not sure that highly intelligent people can have that talent, I think its more likely to be had by a person of average intellect, who works very hard, of which I consider myself. That considered, I believe I can write, not only a worthwhile book, but also a very important one that eloquently expresses the issues and problems we face at this particular time in history using the ideas of the greatest sages of mankind rather than my own.

Preface

No one can seriously argue that we are not experiencing a mental health crisis. A famous academic and YouTube scholar of both theoretical physics and the mental health crisis of narcissism, Sam Vaknin, says that this is not only happening in the West, but all over the world.

I did not write this book to show endless examples of insanity, or try to define it for any other purpose but for the purpose of this book, so that we can examine its opposite, so that we have a solid reference in judging the world around us in the context of its sanity. To understand insanity, one must at least understand sanity.

When I look up the definition of insanity, I need some kind of fundamental definition that will snap into place and match the contents of this book. Insanity, the word, when used all the time, is just another four letter word. It can mean anything, or it can mean pages and pages of definitions, or it can have a fundamental a-priori meaning. Of course, one would expect no clear definition of insanity, but I had to look. The only logical thing to do would be to look up a definition of sanity, for which one would expect a clear definition.

I went to look up the definition of sanity in my Blacks Law 4th Ed, quite honestly, thinking that they may not have a definition of sanity for the same reasons they don't have a definition for "asshole".

Blacks Law 4th Ed. gives the vague (null) definition of "Sound understanding", "the normal condition of the human mind", "the reverse of insanity". In other words, nothing, ***nada, bubkis.*** So in effect, they were not able to give a definition of sanity.

I'm going to define **sanity: lack of desire or willingness to operate in ones own self interest.** By objective and universal standards, I can't imagine how it could really be defined in any other way. On the other hand, under this definition many people in modern societies could be judged as insane. Collectives may be universally judged as insane. This definition doesn't work well in collectives (ethical or policy based) societies and could only be accepted in juristic (law based) societies.

If someone can't operate in their own interest, they cannot operate in

anyone's interest, including their surrounding members of society, leading us to a lawful (a-priori) and universal definition.

We go to the philosophers and find this term **"Highest Good"** being thrown around between the times of the ancient Greeks up until Kant, when he settled internal conflicts inherent in the concept, leading to definitions directly in line with Christianity.

Justice is also a term that gets used often and it is another expression for sanity in law, the law being Christian in the West. The philosophical view is more inline with thinking about people rather than their societies.

Lets assume that "Highest Good" is a term directly inline with pure sanity.

So where to find the highest good? Perhaps the wisest man has the best definition of the highest good. So it makes sense to ask people who was the wisest in all of human history. You get two possible answers "Kant" and "I don't know". I've never heard anything else but one could say "Plato" and argue that effectively, I suppose. I wouldn't want to be the one making the argument.

Plato gave us forms and Kant gave us a foundational explanation for the limitations of our own cognitions.

From the wisest few, two truly wise people I have known, give me Kant as the answer, without really any thought at all as if the answer could never be any different. Many others have said Kant. The two wisest I knew were both were gray haired, successful, PhD, and interdisciplinary.

The curriculum vitae, or resume, of Kant as a Protestant philosopher and scientist is unmatched by anyone, anywhere or at any time. Kant started life as a working class Christian child in Prussia, in Königsberg, in the early seventeen hundreds and earned his way through university by being a tutor and subsequently lectured at Königsberg until shortly before his death.

He provided objective and universal definitions of the true, the good and the beautiful (Antinomy of Taste) that both changed and advanced philosophy in all three domains. Kant's foundational works in the true, the good and the beautiful are still relevant today.

He has been said to give the best possible proof for the existence of God, and his proof is far better than anything you get from talking snakes on

YouTube. These talking snakes know better philosophy than what they give us.

There have been critics of Kant that say he is too systematic, dry and analytic. Heidegger said in his “Being & Time” that part of his motivation for writing his book was that Kant didn’t clearly address the concept of being.

There are objective things that can be said about both human nature and nature itself, these are apodictic truths and cannot be denied. They form a basis for human experience and the anthropologist’s famous three critiques are about nothing other than “Being”, in terms of the true, the good and the beautiful, in how we see them.

He placed sharp limits on the ability of science to understand absolute reality, and shows us exactly what is meant by “spirituality” and “freedom” and that these are the only objective realities we can understand completely.

The one known as the Sage of Königsberg (1724 – 1804) settled the 2000 year long debate between rationalists and empiricists, invented the science of anthropology, and gave us the popular pictures we see of our universe before we had powerful telescopes, known as the Kant – La Place hypothesis. All the pictures of the universe we have seen before big space telescopes of recent times have been of this hypothesis. He formulated the famous and sometimes misunderstood Categorical Imperative, along with a matching strong assertive proof of freedom. No one can know for sure. Perhaps we are all just machinery? Atheists have lazy minds.

In philosophy of science, he wrote the world changing Critique Of Pure Reason. In the realm of morals and ethics, he is a towering figure, in three works. The chapter on self in this book is a summary of his Critique of Practical Reason, his second Critique. His third Critique, The Critique Of Judgment, is one of the most important aesthetic theory books ever written and is the subject of the chapter on aesthetics.

Kant was a well regarded scientist before his works on philosophy and metaphysics which started started at the age of 38, when he read Hume in 1762, which lead to his The Critique of Pure Reason in 1781, having criticisms, but great respect for Hume. The Critique of Pure Reason’s purpose was to refute Hume’s view on cause and effect in the physical world.

He had long-running lectures on anthropology, which he delivered at the University of Königsberg almost every winter semester from 1772/73 until 1795/96. **The University of Königsberg became famous *<u>because of him</u>*, during his time and after.**

Kant was well liked and very highly respected, he sat at tables with dignitaries, was liked by students and faculty and was entertaining at gatherings. He lectured other famous intellects such as Herder and Vigilantus at Königsberg. All post enlightenment philosophy is often said to be commentary on Kant. No one does philosophy without knowing Kant in the modern era.

His writing shows that we are are more the same than different in how we view the world and ourselves in it. We differ in appearance, wealth, abilities and experiences, but underneath all of that is the spirit, and in spirit, we are all more the same than different. If people ever figured this out en-mass the war pigs would be out of business.

This book starts off with a short anachronistic history of thought which lead up to Kant, the following chapter is about Christianity in the West. The first two chapters (Part 1) set the stage for the following three (Part 2). The following three chapters are explanations of the main points of each of his three Critiques, Chapter 3 explains The Critique Of Pure Reason, Chapter 4 explains the Critique of Practical Reason and Chapter 5 explains one half (the important half for this book) of the Critique of Judgment.

This book should give a very complete overview of Kantian thought, and provide a basis for understanding if one is inclined to actually read Kant. If that is the case, you may want to read Sebastian Garners Rutledge Guide and read what Kantians call Jasche's Logic before reading Kant. This is in total about 2000 pages of advanced academic philosophy that makes everything else seem simple. This book will help you understand the big picture, the importance of Kant and understand his key ideas.

The chapter on aesthetics is the real purpose of this book, explaining the second half of Kant's third critique, The Critique Of Judgment. The Critique of Judgment is Kant's crowning achievement and the second half of this book expresses a philosophy of aesthetics that, I think, is more important today than at any other point in history. It's an unfortunate fact that a reader has to understand the points made by the first two critiques to

understand the point of his third.

The Critique of Judgment explains that, in Kant's own words "No man will ever understand the generation of even a single blade of grass". In the exposure of these cognitive limitations we adopt a world view that is in line with our cognitions, and define the **"Highest Good",** and understand what sanity actually is.

The final chapter will be some areas that fit in with Kant although not from Kant, to complete an overall view of the basis of the West and Christianity.

Our conception of self is the same. So why aren't we living in peace? I give possible answers to this question, of which I have obtained from others, in the final chapter. I also put forth a possible explanation in my other book "The Asshole Problem" but from a political rather than self perspective.

This earlier book missed the point, people do know what an asshole is, they just don't care. This could be a lack of sense of self and people need to be reminded of what the word "sanity" means and to restore our natural sense of self.

There is no better expression of the human spirit than that which comes from the greatest sage in all of human history, and its in direct line with truth and justice as conceived by the Americans, the English and in Christianity.

If humanity ever figures out that we are all the same in how we think about virtue, respect and humiliation as well as the a-priori fundamental moral law that defines justice for our species, the war pigs and counterfeiters will be out of business.

Chapter 1: Brief History of Thought

Plato was born in Greece approximately 400 BCE and he both created and studied at the Academy, the first university. He could be said to be the first academic. Before the era of specialization, everyone studied everything – math, philosophy, poetry, gymnastics, music, biology...everything that could be considered was considered.

No one entered the academy without an extensive understanding geometry because the Greeks were all about forms. They held that only formal logic and geometric forms could hold truth. Mans eyes could be fooled but not his logic, which by definition was infallible.

The truth in a table or a chair could only be held in its form because truth, by its nature is unchanging and no two tables or chairs are identical. Deducing form from empirical observations was the function of intellect. Rules and laws are born of thought & observation and become what was and still is, an evolving understanding.

Math was centered around Euclidean geometry, now moderns often go around saying (wrongly) that physics proves that Euclid was wrong and that the shortest distance between two points is not a straight line. Forms are the only absolute truths we can know and in the physical space we live in, Euclidean geometry is an absolute truth.

Any ancient economist could have made the same arguments as the people do today against Euclid. If you want to go from where you are sitting now to any other place in a city, you will find that a straight line is almost always a very long path. You could be bitten by a dog, shot by a neighbor, fall off a building, into a hole, hit by a car, or be arrested by police on your way to a destination. The shortest path is usually along sidewalks, roads or paths.

In physics, by shortest path, they mean the minimum energy path of which physics is particularly centered around. Nature always takes the shortest path is a maxim of judgment in physics. Formally this idea is based on the symmetry of nature.

In a discipline with an ontology of matter and energy in space and time, the shortest distance in terms of energy is a curve. Matter and energy involve

more than just ideals, they are things we experience. Even the apple doesn't fall exactly straight down from a tree. The earth is spinning, there is air resistance and wind, and there is relativity.

There is **Fact**, the world we experience, and **Right**, the world of abstract forms such as ideal geometrical shapes, math, virtue, respect, humiliation, original writ, Original Sin, and the Catholic Trinity. Only in **Right** do we find absolute truths, one of the main thematic points of this book.

The shortest distance between two points is an ideal that only works in pure reasoned geometry, this idea cannot and will not ever change. It is part of the basis for the forms of everything and is an a-priori intuition of the mind. Without this idea, a conception of the size of an object is not possible.

From geometry and math, other forms come into existence such as circles or triangles but in practice we can never see a perfect triangle or circle. Without these forms, modern physical science would not be possible. These forms allow us to create mathematical models of everything we build and can therefore predict that a building won't fall down before we build it. These forms come from pure reason, outside empirical observations.

Without circles, the study of vibration would be impossible. The ideal of the circle is part of any mathematics that deals with vibrations. Bridges, buildings, any structure and all particles and electricity all vibrate.

Platonic forms are an integral part of applied science.

Without the original writ and Catholic Trinity, common law, or just courts and Western governments in their recently past form would not be possible.

Plato is best known today for his political philosophy. Plato believed that society needed a philosopher king, an ideal man to lead it. The shaping of the ideal man was to take place in the Academy. Plato was a hard core authoritarian.

The Republic of Plato is a book outlining an intellectual journey of Socrates, who only asked questions of various members of Greek society. His focus was on defining justice, and to see if anyone could define it. The rich man said that justice is the payments of ones debt, the strong man said it was the right of the stronger, the ordinary man said it was what we call the

Golden Rule, the politician said justice was to help your friends and harm your enemies.

The conclusion of the book explained the ultimate justice was to have the magic ring which made one invisible. One could go around satisfying every inclination of the beast within, and as long as he was invisible. He could maintain an image of perfect virtue in the eyes of his countrymen when he was visible, when not wearing the ring. We see this Platonic ideal expressed in the actions of Politicians today. People who hold this view see themselves as especially enlightened.

A generation or two after Plato came Aristotle who insisted that truth must be observed and that observations, empiricism, occupied the high ground in the finding of absolute truth. His claim to fame was his rejection of Platonic forms.

Aristotle started developing physics from his observations, but made a critical error. No one could observe friction in Aristotle's world because it was everywhere, in a similar way a fish experiences water. A fish could never comprehend the concept of water unless he got caught by a fisherman or had to jump out of the water. It's likely that Aristotle never experienced a frozen river, lake or pond. He made an error in his failure to recognize friction in his observations and his equations didn't work and he arrested the development of physics until just before the days of the German Enlightenment.

We experience things by what they are as well as what they are not, so having friction everywhere prevented them from considering it. Philosophers call this "negation" and the idea predates negative numbers.

Aristotle had valuable contributions to the soft sciences such as politics, psychology and biology as well as hard sciences such as logic and mathematics. He is well known for his "The Politic" in which, through excruciating detail, he outlines the circular devolution and evolution of societies through despotism, democracy, republic, oligarchical rule of kings and philosopher kings. He has a big thick book that explains these processes in what only can be described as excruciatingly detailed and accurate in describing how societies devolve from the rule of philosopher kings down to despotism, with democracy as the second last stage in the decay.

Reading Aristotle is the best way of understanding today's politic as

well as the basic characteristics and personalities of all the different classes that exist in society.

According to Aristotle, politics is the study of conspiracy and there will always be a ruling class that is above the law. Aristotle could be said to be one of many great thinkers in a long list of conspiracy theorists throughout history, long before vaccines, income tax on labour, and water fluoridation.

Aristotle came up with the most profound definition of justice: “to live according to ones nature”.

Implicitly obvious, in all of this is, our big brains, big hands, lack of claws or sharp teeth. Our nature is co-operation, we are social animals and none of us can stand alone. Babies die without attention, people without social connection live abnormally short lives. Soldiers come back from unjust wars with post traumatic stress disorder.

The Greeks and other philosophers were very occupied with cognition and the physical and moral world that surrounds us. The study of physics would remain an integral part of philosophy up until the German enlightenment where knowledge expanded, or as some say, exploded, no one could know everything and people slowly began to specialize. Physics and philosophy became separate departments.

Jesus Christ lived under the ten commandments about 400 years after Plato and Aristotle and observed the licentiousness of the rabbis and broke with them to formulate the regulative principle of the single commandment of the New Testament, to treat others as you would be treated, or to love God with all your heart and mind, both of these being synonymous.

Original sin is a key doctrine of Christianity, illustrated when Christ asked the person who had never sinned to cast the first stone in a stoning execution in the New Testament. All men are sinners is Christian doctrine that explains why political systems need a regulative principle. (Kant gives us more concise explanation as to what original sin actually means, in the chapter on the self in this book)

This clearly definable rational universal statement made Christianity scientific and took the power from kings and Christians have been the most heavily persecuted religion through history ever since Christ was nailed to the cross by kings. Pilate had to execute him because he would not pledge

allegiance to the kings of Rome, who could have protected him from the Jewish kings. The idea couldn't die with Christ because it stood on solid rational ground and Christ was reborn.

Later doctrines such as Grace and the Trinity were deduced from this commandment and the contents of the New Testament. Christianity was a revolution from, not an evolution of, Judaism. The church viewed the wine as reason, something that gets better with age as the Catholics continued inquiries into science and reason. Water was the law of man, the ten commandments and the laws of commerce, known then as The Law Merchant and now the Uniform Commercial Code of today, as developed by merchants.

The metaphor of the water and wine contrasted empirical, or understandings with the growing faculty of reason. Mixing water with wine was sometimes necessary, such is in the laws of marriage which had theological (pure reason) as well as civil aspects but Christians were warned by Christ to beware of the pharisees who mixed water with wine. Mixing water with wine can create confusing dialectics which are intended to confuse. In modern parlance, this is known as a subreption.

What does "Equality" mean? Equality in Fact (Outcome)? or Equality in Right (Equal Rights)? Confusion from dialectics runs much deeper than this, as we shall see.

This law of Christianity has been most clearly laid out by that "great citizen", Samuel Pfendorf, a famous jurist who wrote the famous "Law of Nature and Nations". His works provide a deep understanding of some of the cryptic doctrines of Christ, verse by verse, as applied to the science of jurisprudence around the time of the German Enlightenment. The science of jurisprudence was the first subject matter ever denoted as a "science" and this was from the Roman lawyers. Jurisprudence is the science of truth itself.

St Augustine, born around 400 AD, began to question the nature of God and man and deduced that humans had the three faculties of memory, understanding and care. God could be seen through a stained glass window and as an enigma consisting of the father, the son and the holy ghost as man was made in the image of God, in the eyes of man. Man being made in the image of God doesn't mean God has hands and feet, it's an abstraction for the philosophy of mind. Christianity became Trinitarian. It is a useful

abstraction but isn't an absolute truth, like the atom, which like God, we cannot see. The Christian Godhead is the Trinity, not an arbitrary being but an expression of the creator as far as human cognition can deduce rather than a blind faith in a single creator as in older stone age religions. The Trinity will be explained in subsequent chapters and is a thematic point of this book.

Kant was an anti materialist and his philosophy shows that the world cannot be broken down into constituent parts using mere cognition. Being an anthropologist, he broke down human consciousness into three irreducible categories: cognition, desire & pleasure, which philosophers call the true, the good and the beautiful. His three famous Critiques, written in that order are on the subject of cognition (1st), desire (2nd) and pleasure (3rd).

Materialist philosophers try to break down the three into simple cognition, the stuff of AI, and the value and importance of Kant is that he proves this cannot be.

This breakdown, along with the anti materialist argument will comprise most of the material in the 3rd, 4th and 5th chapters.

Kant's proof of God is known to be the best proof of the existence of the Christian God. Disagree with him all you want, but note that you are disagreeing with a true sage, the likes of which only comes every few thousand years. Also know that he is arguing from pure logic.

Kant showed us that the world of matter could never be known and that only the moral law and math were absolute truths. Freedom of will is held as an absolute truth by Kant and is an easily demonstrated truth. The proofs of this are simple and will be illustrated in the chapter on the self.

In our world of materialism, artificial intelligence and artificial intellects, its no surprise that Kant is slowly being forgotten. He is largely misunderstood and the three chapters outlining his works should clear up some of this popular misunderstandings as well as shame his most well known detractor, Nietzsche.

Kant didn't merely make statements, and had no regard for opinions, he made proofs. By the end of this book you will wonder why you perhaps never heard of him. You may look toward our communist governments.

Appendices explain counter arguments to the Kantian system as well as

explain misunderstanding regarding Kant that are popular with public intellectuals. Kings do not like people knowing absolutes, the limits of their cognitions or using forms to deduce truth and resolve conflicts. Kings depend on strife between people.

Chapter 2: Christianity & The West

The subject of philosophy has a very wide scope, as philosophy means "love of thought". Its often been said that Western philosophy is lacking something that Eastern philosophy has. Its been said that Western philosophy is too left brained, too mechanical while Eastern philosophy sees a bigger picture.

This may be true but this book isn't about philosophy in general or about defending the Western or Eastern Weltanschauung. This book is about the Western conception of law and freedom and its basis in rational thought. Western ideas regarding truth and justice are directly in line with the natural consciousness of a neurotypical person, which makes Western societies seem both fair and good to those that live in them.

For peace on earth, everyone has to agree on what is right and what is wrong. There is only one possibility for this and that is that we adopt a rational objective universal law. Everyone can only agree on that which is objective and universal. Only objective and universal law can lead to peace on earth.

The Jewish Bible warns us of the Tower of Babel, and explains why God created different nations and languages. Nationalism is a bulwark against a possible international tyrannies, much like a large ship has bulwarks against flooding of the hull from a leak or collision. Billions of dollars are spent to make people think Christian nationalism is evil. Educational policies prevent people from learning true Western history or the doctrines of Christ which are the foundations of the West.

The foundation of the West is built on solid logic and cannot be destroyed. It only appears to be destroyed inside the soft, thick and empty skulls that populate "universities" and Pentagon controlled corporate media. Rational objective universal truths cannot just disappear any more than the laws of geometry can disappear. Oligarchs, kings and communists do not create reality, they can only mask reality.

The foundation of the West is rational universal law and this law is built on Christianity, the law procedures and rules created in Rome and the right of self that started in Rome and was further developed in English and

German common law. Its purely rational and provides the basis of political freedom that people used to experience in the West. It is mechanical, rational, fair and objective, or was, before the West sold its soul to private banks, went bankrupt in 1933, and was forced to let the devil inside its courthouses and houses of legislation.

Lawyers, judges and clerics wore a black robe to symbolize the dead letter of the law – that the law was settled, known and understood. The science of law, as it is centered around the Trinitarian consciousness of the West, has been largely settled and can be understood by nearly anyone. Once understood it can be viewed, by neurotypical people, as being subjectively fair and good, no one can point to a defect in the Common Law.

Rational objective universal law is the subject of the works of the Sage of Königsberg, who justified all of his works through proof, much the same as mathematicians prove their theorems. There are theorems in moral law. Natural "a-priori" (Kantian) morality is objective and universal.

The difference between Eastern and Western conceptions of law and freedom is the regulative single commandment of the New Testament. Oriental societies are ethical, traditional Western societies (Occidental) are juristic. Ethical societies are built around the hopes, dreams and aspirations of a ruling class. Juristic societies are constructed from rational, universal, objective law and a sense of morality that is inline with the "moral law" of Immanuel Kant, Jesus Christ, the Greek's "Golden Rule" and the jurists "Original Writ".

The West is no longer favored or trusted in the world, and Christianity is seen as the root of this evil. The foreign policy of the Western countries is anything but Christian, it has been the opposite of Christianity, referred to as "Western Suzerainty" by a famous author, Edward Said, pronounced as "Sa-eed", in "Orientalism". I noticed, in his book, that nothing objective could be said about Orientalism. Orientalism and Occidentalism are opposites in terms of their views on freedom. Oriental societies are collectives, or ethical societies. Occidental societies are (were) juristic before they sold their soul in 1913 to the private banking oligarchy.

Any law must be based on a theology, there is no other way to have laws. Laws are unchangeable, by definition, and therefore cannot be written by men. The Networks and other talking snakes refer to legislators as

“lawmakers”, this is not in fact true, they write statutes. Statutes must be written within the envelope of law, and the state religion determines this law.

A state must be based on a religion to guide its legislators and people, to prevent legislators from becoming the gods, as lawmakers. All men are sinners, legislators are men and the West is losing its religion.

The West is (was) purely Christian, it has Trinitarian courts and governments, with a law that is based on the single commandment of the New Testament. ***The idea that governments and churches must be separate is a key Christian doctrine, not an effort to keep Christianity out of government.***

In the West, governments deal with **Fact.** Religion (Christianity) and the common law courts deals with **Right**.

Christianity has always been spread by the word, with missionaries rather than armies. The traditional view or mainstream view of history is just completely ridiculous, “cartoonish” perhaps, as anyone who reads knows and is very much slanted against the West and Christianity.

The West fell asleep under comfort and a ruling class took over with private financial institutions who bought the souls of their countries with promises, who want collectivism to be the rule of law, who need wars to reinforce the value of their otherwise worthless currency and to carry out their agenda of world government. Western minds have been destroyed in this process.

Wars are profitable for the military industrial complex and ruling class, the wars are expensive and keep everyone working to maintain a strong economy to support the wars. Its been called a “central bank war economy” by a leading economist and thinker, Catherine Austin Fitts.

Privately owned central banks are the real powers of the world, they control interest rates. If the president of the United States does something they don’t like, interest rates can be changed, wrecking the economy, and elected politicians are thrown out of office by an angry public who thinks the president runs the country. The country is run on a long term agenda, much longer than a presidential term, and in the interest of a higher power than the people.

One of the best and most reliable books on money was written in the

70's by a famous Canadian economist J.K. Galbraith in "Money: Whence it Came; Where It Went". The politic is implicitly controlled by private interests and private banks who quietly ease us toward a world government.

Alan Greenspan in a since scrubbed video on YouTube clearly and pithily explained that the governor of the central bank doesn't answer to the president of the United States. In fact, the governors answer to the board of directors and owners of these private institutions. Governors, but not directors, are appointed by the president to make the Federal Reserve look federal.

War profits are enormous. A fifty thousand dollar bomb, who's cost is mainly in graft and corruption, supports the happy and rich military industrial complex at home, but that same fifty thousand dollar bomb can do millions of dollars of damage, for which loans are required for reconstruction.

Countries must be financed by the private central banks if they wish to trade with other countries and rebuild and so fall under private central bank control, which is the real purpose of the wars. This is explained in a book called "Confessions of an Economic Hit Man", by John Perkins. It's all about control, not money. Collectives must be controlled.

The Russian and Chinese communist (collectivist) revolutions, in which approximately 100 million Christians were murdered wholesale and retail in the last century alone were financed by Western oligarchs. Anthony Sutton, in his book, Wall Street and the Bolshevik Revolution, and many others explain this.

The nature of the many communist revolutions over the past century, in magnitude, in sickness and depravity has never been depicted on a Hollywood screen. Nothing remotely comparable has ever been seen on the nightly news. Nothing that is commonly known, believed, or even imagined in the West regarding war and genocides can compare to what Christians experienced last century in this multitude of communist revolutions. Westerners don't know this aspect of history because their governments are Communists who are in nearly absolute control of the minds of a large portion of the population. Western minds are being turned into chowder that has been slowly going rotten.

We are in a narcissism epidemic. Narcissism has the close cousin of

fanaticism. (this will be made clear and the chapter of the self) Fanaticism is necessary to start wars. Wars are fought for money (The Republic of Plato) in reality, but to the common man, wars are fought for "moral" reasons. Common men aren't going to fight to help the banks concentrate their wealth and form a communist world government, but they will fight for what they perceive as a moral cause.

Western history is a series of lies of both commission and omission. It's conflicts, causes and results bear little, if any, resemblance to what is depicted on the Hollywood screen or taught in academic institutions, even at the highest levels. The Hollywood Hitler is to Hitler as Bugs Bunny is to rabbits because Hitler opposed the soul crushing world government agenda that we are now facing.

Its freemen vs the financial institutions, and we are surrounded by fanatics.

Its wrong to hold the son responsible for the sins of his ancestors, or even his father. This is particularly true when the information obtained to make judgments comes from expert liars and manipulators, people who are paid very well to convert a steaming hot pile of bovine excrement into an exact facsimile of the true, the good and the beautiful. Every country administered Kovid shots. The Jewish world government has been covert but now is coming into full view.

Fanaticism drives wars which will kill off the no longer needed and possibly rebellious armies when Central Bank Digital Currencies rule every single aspect of our lives. Those who know too much by playing key roles will be next on the chopping block. Communists don't want people to have memories.

This isn't a history book. History can be useful only as a regulative principle, it can warn us about what not to do, but cannot give us anything constitutive. It's never been truthful enough for anyone to derive a vindictive attitude toward another from it.

To go somewhere one must look through the front windshield of the car, the rear view mirror is only used in a regulative sense, to prevent us from backing into something while parking or to warn us of a dangerous driver that may be approaching from the rear.

The front windshield is where hope and possibility lie. Everyone wants a future based on hope and possibility. Everyone knows that looking through the rear view mirror makes objects appear larger than they are.

In broad strokes, history can demonstrate the danger of collectives. In small strokes history demonstrates mans ability to write fiction.

Oligarchies and kings love war and collectivism, these concentrate power, and hate is necessary for war. Leaders of collectives are always looking to the rear for ways of justifying the dark trinity of hate, fear and revenge to lead people into war. They use fanaticism to drive warfare.

History can always provide justification for fanaticism, for any group, against any other group, just through lies of omission as well as bold lies of commission. The dark trinity keeps the war pigs in business and drives the world toward totalitarian control.

The core concepts of Christianity and Immanuel Kant are the subject of the book and I will, not argue, but prove, using Kantian metaphysics that Christianity is an authentic expression of human nature itself. Kant corrects the errors of the ancient Greeks, the Epicureans, Stoics and Plato and resolves their conflict regarding the “highest truth” in things. Kant has sharp criticisms of others such as Spinoza, whom he believed got it closest to reality.

This could lead us back to sanity.

Kantianism and Christianity are all about the single commandment of the New Testament. The rational deductions of the Sage of Königsberg show and justify a natural authentic human spirit, which is directly in line with Christianity. If you have never heard of Kant, you will wonder why by the end of this book.

To explain the very basis of Christianity I’m going to use a metaphor in writing a little bit of history. I’m sure I have read something like this elsewhere, likely from Christian apologists in the past. Perhaps one in a thousand church going Christians understand this, a key and defining aspect of their religion.

*****

Some time ago people began to settle the West. People lived on land spanning over great distances and railways were created to facilitate moving

people, goods and specialist service providers across these distances. A new academic discipline, engineering, developed from this effort as engineers applied the newly discovered laws of physics to figure out how to make steam engines work.

The properties of physics, as they apply to railroad engines, became very well understood, but the trains could never be made to run on time. A railway system composed of trains that cannot run on time may as well not exist. People would be better off traveling by horse than having to stay in a hotel in a strange town by arriving early, or missing their connection altogether.

Engineers experimented, adding more dials and controls to the engines to make them more controllable. Although the operation of each part of the engine was completely understood, getting all these parts to operate together predictably, as a system was beyond what mathematics could do.

A snow drift, a moose, herd of buffalo, hills, valleys, dead or fallen trees and weather would always play a role in changing the speed of the train and engineers would struggle to tune their controls while watching pressure gauges, flow rates and thermometers to get the train running at a desired speed again, to make the scheduled stops.

The great innovation that made the trains run on time was a mechanical speed controller. The engineer merely had to set the speed, a centrifugal device provided feedback on the speed of the train, mechanically compared it to the desired speed, as set by the engineer and automatically adjusted air intake to regulate the burning rate of the coal, and therefore amount of steam produced to meet the speed requirement.

The engineer no longer had to be pre-occupied with trying to adjust dials while watching meters to meet the speed requirement. The job became setting the desired speed and ensuring the engine had enough fuel and water to stay running. The engine speed was controlled and the feedback regulator made the trains run on time and created the new modern network of railroads.

*****

This innovation was called a governor and the idea has been extended into the modern age, where electronic controllers regulate the operation of

machinery as well as electrical circuits themselves.

This subject matter of systems still haunts us today, even with modern lightning fast digital controllers, systems of anything larger than ten or twenty variables are practically impossible to control. It is surprising and counter intuitive that we just don't have the math for it yet. Sophisticated systems are a product of both art and science. We see the limits of modern systems theory in robots, drones and in military fighter jets in their acrobatic flight maneuvers.

This idea of a "feedback" was already used in the common law courts where the jury was the final arbitrator in the justness of the law and its effect on the accused. The legal machinery was regulated to prevent it from jailing an obviously innocent man. The independent jury was a safeguard against what we now call "lawfare", that sickness of licentiousness, as well as unjust or political persecution, and pure legalism, a machine that can grind human beings into hamburger. So where did the courts get this soon to be explained idea? - certainly not from Plato. The following passage outlines problems faced by Platonists.

The Republic of Plato was written by the Greeks approximately 400 years BC. It is one of the most important books ever written. Being written on clay tablets, before ink and scrolls, means every word mattered and there are enough layers of eternal truth behind the words for it to be a topic of a lifetime of study, debate & discussion.

From Allan Blooms translation second edition, starting at section 425 e, my comment in square brackets:

"It isn't worthwhile," he said "to dictate to gentlemen. Most of these things that need legislation they will, no doubt, easily find for themselves"

"Yes, my friend," I said, provided, that is, a god grants them the preservation of the laws we described before."

"And if not," he said "they'll spend their lives continually setting down such rules and correcting them, thinking they'll get hold of what's best."

"You mean," I said, "that such men will live like those who are sick, due to licentiousness, aren't willing to quit their worthless way of life"

"Most certainly."

"And don't they go on charmingly? For all their treatment, they get no where, except, of course, to make their illnesses more complicated and bigger, always hoping that if someone would just recommend a drug [ideology], they will be – thanks to it – healthy."

"Yes," he said "the affections of men who are sick in this way are exactly like that."

"What about this?" I said. "Isn't it charming in them that they believe the greatest enemy of all is the man who tells the truth"...

One may say I've taken this quote out of context, as it pertains to drinking, stuffing ones self, sex, and idleness, but the same principle applies with addictions to an ideological agenda and power. Ideologies can create unbridled passion and the blindness, fanaticism.

The Republic of Plato is a seminal work, especially for anyone wanting to understand political science and philosophy, it did not answer critical questions, merely asked questions, in the spirit of Socrates, and suggested possible, but sometimes nonsensical answers.

The Greeks did not have a notion of kings being regulated. They sought to develop the perfectly just man in education to have philosopher kings and guardians.

Christ came after Plato and Socrates and provided a way for people to judge their rulers, and each other, leading to more peaceful interactions. The rational universal law of Christ could never die, although kings depend on strife to stay in power and are on this basis, ideologically opposed to universal law and have relentlessly persecuted Christians throughout (erased) history.

The Old Testament is said to be written by the prophets of God. It is a story of a chosen people constantly trying to fix things, and in their efforts to create a better world, genocide, war and famine were the result. Ten commandments handed down by Moses were to guide men's actions and be the standard from which to judge. The ten commandments were an ideal, one that no man could perfectly emulate, leaving lots of space for kings to move around in persecuting undesirables and creating fanatics for wars and genocides of their opponents.

The rabbinic law written to solve these problems occupies forty

volumes. They reject the trinity and the feedback mechanism of the regulative law of Christ. They say, in their rule books, that Christ resides in hell, for all eternity, boiling in a vat of excrement and semen.

Henry Kissinger has said that no Jewish society can survive more than about 70 years and its well known that Jews have been kicked out of countries 109 times.

Moses is said to have written the ten commandments, the one relevant to this discussion is “Love thy neighbor as thyself”.

It is a regulative principle that is the governing principle of Christian and Western law. It leads to the law of obligations. Obligations, to be just, must be mutual. Love thy neighbor as thyself is the same commandment as the commandment for the love of God.

Christianity forbids slavery and of the three big religions in the West, is the only one that forbids slavery. Kings want Christianity to disappear off the planet and to be forgotten. Kings want slaves under their absolute control. They see ordinary people the way we see insects on when walking down a sidewalk.

PART 2

Chapter. 3: Authenticity of Space and Time

"Reality: Wow, what a concept!"

Mork from the TV sitcom "Mork and Mindy"

Kant's has a famous quip regarding an ultimate truth and two philosophers milking a he-goat. One is milking, the other holds a sieve underneath. Our understanding of the physical world ultimately depends on intuition, not absolute truths. This chapter will prove that the physical world of space and time is "turtles all the way down"(syllogisms) and that there are no absolute truths in the perception of objects.

Without an absolute truth, how can anything be known to be true? The answer lies in perception. Human cognition cannot develop a warrant that would even suggest the world exists as we see it. There is no possible way of asserting that the world exists as we see it, it is strictly a leap of faith. In this chapter I will illustrate Kant's proof for this. In the appendix I will show glitches in the time space continuum.

Science just gets us a hot cup of coffee before work in the morning, it keeps us comfortable and nothing more. From it there are no great insights of life. As we shall see, the only absolute truths come from the laws of freedom, in the following chapter.

Any list of the ten most important books ever written will include Kant's Critique of Pure Reason. In most of this chapter I will explain, prove and illustrate the thematic point of the book.

This chapter and the next two are likely going to fundamentally alter the way you view the world, and this and the following two chapters, like rich foods, should not be taken in all at once to be appreciated. It would be better to read this chapter in the morning, let it settle into your mind over a few days before going to the next. It may be something that you will want to

read two or three times. Over indulging in rich foods leads to a sick stomach, reading too many new ideas at once can lead to a confused mind.

Settling the debate between the ultimate truth between rationalism and empiricism in philosophy was groundbreaking. It broke philosophy into a pre and post Kantian era. After reading this and the following chapter, you will find that talking snakes either do not understand Kant, or pretend they do not. Hopefully, in these few pages I can clear up basic misunderstandings regarding objective cognition and its limitations.

Kant was an empirical realist in contrast to the idealists of his age. This is a main point of confusion with regard to Kant that many people who read philosophy hold. This will be made more clear in the following chapters.

The term a-priori gets tossed around a lot, to many, the phrase “a-priori conceptions” means that humans are “pre-wired” to perceive things in a certain way. If we are, or are not, is the subject of empirical psychology, not philosophy of mind.

It is an a-priori requirement for you to have this book in front of you for you to read it. How the book arrived in your hands is not relevant. A-priori means both prior to and necessarily.

This chapter and the next two are about philosophy of mind. Kant had a long polemic against empirical psychology which is beyond the scope of this book. There are three great mysteries in life: time, space and the “I”, not the “I” that is reading this book, but the “I” that knows it is reading this book, the thing we call a soul. Andrew Brook of Canada wrote a well known book on the topic, “Kant And The Mind”.

Experience starts with time and space, so lets examine these two perceptions. How do we think about space itself? Can we think about space without thinking about an object in space? Any time we think about or talk about space we are actually talking about the objects that lie within space or the size of an object that could lie within a space, not actual space itself.

Time is the same way, we think of time as events that occur within time, not time itself. The clock ticks, we get older, life is a set of experiences that occurred ordered in time. It’s the effect of time, not time itself, that we perceive as time.

Time gives us the a-priori conception of arithmetic. First you have one,

then another,...this leads us to the a-priori conception of arithmetic counting.

Space gives us an a-priori knowledge of core principles of geometry. The shortest distance between two points being a straight line is an a-priori concept. Arithmetic and geometry can be considered as developed by mathematicians without any reference to the material world around us. They are based on pure reason alone and are eternal truths.

The ontology of physics is matter and energy, these are seen to be within an envelope of space and time. Physics doesn't study the very nature of time or space. In no way does physics discredit Euclidean space, Euclidean space is a tool for physicists, even when they are formulating curved space and time. Tensors and relativistic expressions are referenced from the linear space of a-priori Euclidean geometry.

In space we can conceptualize the idea of distance. Without the Euclidean postulates being a-priori, no one would be able to say one distance is greater than another. We measure distance as the length of a straight line that lies between two points. For this we need the a-priori concept of a straight line.

Space and time cannot be said to have been obtained from experiment, simple deduction, or any cognitive thought process. We can know nothing about space and time. We only the objects that lie within this envelope. We know nothing of it, like Aristotle not understanding friction because he never experienced the negation of friction. We have never been outside of space and time.

We know objects in space and time in a phenomenal sense because our intellects are finite. The actual nominal objects remain unknown, although we do experience them, not as they are but as we recreate them in our minds, as a phenomenon. Noumenal objects are the real objects, whatever they may be, phenomenal objects are what we experience in our minds.

Berkeley is famous for saying that maybe it's all in our heads. Kant answered this concern by examining dreams. We can only dream of combinations of things that we have seen or experienced while awake. You could dream of dinosaurs, porcupines and airplanes, but only if you have had experience with seeing or knowing of these objects first. Your imagination can bring them together in a dream, perhaps a dinosaur you are being chased by is flying an airplane and dropping porcupines on you.

Knowledge can be discursive, reflective or intuitive, the knowledge we will talk about is discursive because “intuition” just means we don’t know how we know, or we are immediately conscious of the “what” but “why” is shrouded. Reflective judgment, in contrast, is the subject of the chapter on aesthetics.

We need to have discursive intellects because a discursive intellect can create rules and laws. We don’t need to know every apple tree to know that apples always fall down, not up, from apple trees. A discursive intellect can formulate laws.

There are two possible ways of gaining knowledge, one being synthesis (synthetic) and the other being analysis (analytic).

The well known example of a synthetic proposition is that (1) All men are mortal, (2) Socrates is a man (3) Therefore Socrates is mortal. In true scientific knowledge, the major premise is a statement that comes from our a-priori conception of reality, or a consequence of it, an understanding, the second, the minor premise, is a known fact through reasoning or logic, the third the judgment, is the conclusion. The three create a syllogism.

Analytical knowledge, by contrast does not use syllogisms, if I have an apple, inside the apple I know there are seeds. I get the knowledge of the seeds from only the knowledge of the apples. Once I have an apple I know I have seeds without any consideration of anything else, one idea. I need the apple and the tree, two ideas, to know apples fall from trees.

Synthetic knowledge has the governing principle that **everything happens for a reason**, synthetic knowledge comes from syllogisms, two premises and a judgment. **Analytical** knowledge has the **principle of non contradiction**. I can’t say I have an apple and at the same time say I have no seeds. Its either an apple, therefore has seeds or is something else (assuming seedless apples don’t exist). These two principles, analysis and synthesis, underlay all of what we know.

Neither time nor space can be known through analytic or synthetic propositions because they are not predicated on anything else.

In most instances we are practicing technique, not hard science, for instance (1) Only mammals feed babies mothers milk (2) Porcupines feed babies from their breasts (3) Therefore porcupines are mammals. The

difference between technique, or art, and pure science is that pure science is built on an a-priori foundation of perception, the raw ideas that underlay physical science. Kant railed against chemistry being a science, he explained that it should be considered an art because it had no a-priori basis in time and space, it starts with a set of observations only, back in the late 1700's.

Before going further, philosophy needs two terms which are often used in academic discussions and they need to be explained. **Ontology** is "being", it means "what it is", what its boundaries are. The ontology of physics is the study of matter and energy. The **epistemology** of physics is math and observations, the math has to match the observations for something to be regarded as true, truth in **Fact** (observations) and truth in **Right** (theories that explain the observations) are required for a theory to be regarded as true.

The a-priori intuitions of time and space are not yet enough for us to be able to perceive objects in time and space. For us to experience objects in space, or be able to conceptualize ideas we need epistemelogical categories to synthesize and understand perceptions. Kant has both epistemological (objects in time & space) and ontological (any possible idea or concept) categories. The ontological categories are outside the scope of this book and a subject for logicians. Here I will explain and illustrate the epistemelogical categories necessary for object perception. Both the categories of object perception as well as those for the knowledge of good and evil are rooted in the ontological categories.

Aristotle was the first to work out these categories, he came up with a list of ten. Kant boiled them down to four essential categories. Nothing can be understood without categories.

For now, lets take a look at the epistemological categories, the categories that enable us to perceive objects in time and space. These categories are often termed the "Pure Concepts of Understanding". If we learn these or they are pre-wired in our brains is not relevant to this book they are the subject of empirical psychology, not philosophy of mind.

In this chapter we are talking about what is a-priori to object perception as well as dialectical illusions that occur when we view space and time as objects in themselves and not merely an envelope necessary for perception of objects.

These four categories required to experience objects in space are: Quantity, Quality, Relation and Modality. These are a-priori to us experiencing objects in time and space. Without the categories we could never make sense of the world that lies outside ourselves, or even that which lies within, as free agents, the subject of the next chapter.

Quantity refers to the size of the object, Quality refers to its inner quality. To see or experience a sphere, it must have a size (Quantity) and color (Quality). All objects are either simple objects or combinations of simple objects.

To experience a dog, we need its size (quantity) and its breed (quality). The dog is a substance, not an apparition (modality), it causes other events, barking, and has a causality related to its existence, it walked over to you, you got it from a pound, etc. (relation).

If you simply walk by a dog, notice its size and breed, and do not interact with it, or see it do something, then you don't really experience the dog in the full sense of experience. Experience requires all four categories.

Relation, the third category, has the subcategories substance, causality and community. An object must be a substance, it can be a gas, liquid or solid, but it must be substantiative – have mass and occupy volume if it is to be sensed as an object.

Causation is an a-priori intuition that makes sense of the world for us. If something happens, it must have a cause for us to understand it, for it to fit into our minds, for it to be connected in a community of objects. Nothing moves by itself.

The idea of a causation from empirical observations alone (Hume was wrong) could never occur to us. We would have no way to relate events in the physical world, or to even believe there is a relationship, or an interest in even trying to make sense of it all. There would be no cognitive tools to do so. We would remain completely confused and unable to even begin to cognize a phenomenological reality, without even knowing that we don't know. We live in a causal world, we have no physical experience that is non causal, remember Aristotle with friction. A physical world outside causality is unknown and could not be understood.

Modality refers to the reality of the object, is it merely hypothetical, IE

there could be a bear where you are camping, or assertoric, you saw the bear scat left on your campsite when you returned, or apodictic, the bear has been waiting for you to return and you can see it now running through the bushes toward you.

How far can these categories go? Can they apply in the infinite? questions of God? the real size of space, etc? It turns out that they cannot. The categories allow us to conceive or perceive objects that may occur in experience, but create dialectical illusions between reason and understanding when we apply them outside the domain of experience.

This means that we can only know objects as phenomenon inside a finite envelope of space and time, outside, in the infinite, ideas fall into dialectical illusions when space and time are considered as things in themselves.

Modern physics requires atom's to exist if it is to be a science, as Kant explains in his book "Metaphysics Of Natural Science" (1786), a short book written to clarify these Categories of Pure Understanding. The atom meets the requirements of an object as perceived through these epistemological categories, and this is necessary for us to study substance, as we perceive it.

The substance itself must be based on other objects. Atom's are models that are created to explain how matter and energy behaves, not the actual matter and energy, as it is in itself. Electrons, protons and neutrons are particles that we have as phenomenon to help us understand and create mathematical models that predict the behavior of substances. We cannot conceptualize substance in any way except through the use of another more fundamental substance. In reality, atom's can only be observed by the electromagnetic waves they emit. We identify substances with spectral analysis, not by looking at actual atom's.

Kant predicted that the particles that define the atom will simply get smaller and more numerous as physics perfects the model to explain all behavior of matter and energy. People who believe in atom's as an absolute reality are termed atomists in philosophy and atomism has been around in one form or another for thousands of years. We do science so we can build things, so we can have hot coffee before work, not to know absolute truth, contrary to the faith of the atomist.

Modern science is in no way equipped to address the question of God.

Sophistry is something that happens when we mix independent subjects expecting to clarify one or the other. This is muddying waters to make them appear deep, as Nietzsche once said. Kant talks about ideas such as theosophy, which mixes theology and philosophy as not suitable for a normal healthy mind.

Kant's Antinomies are viewed by many as a central idea of the Critique Of Pure Reason. An Antinomy is a form of dialectal illusion that occurs when reason or understanding is applied to a domain outside this finite envelope of space and time. There is an antimony for each of the four categories, a contradiction, something like, but not identical to a paradox, called a dialectical illusion.

The Antinomies are positive proof that we cannot see the world as it truly is when we view space and time as things in themselves and not merely intuitions. We have no idea what constitutes time and space and applying these concepts as objects in themselves can lead us to a dialectical illusion, as soon will be shown.

Reflecting on these ideas of categories, time and space is the topic of the four Antinomies in Kant's Critique Of Pure Reason. In this book, in the interest of brevity and clarity, I will examine two Antinomies, one pertaining to the category of quantity, the other for relation, in particular the nature of causality which is one of three sub headings for the category of Relation: substance, causality and community.

If we treat space and time as objects or concepts in themselves rather than intuitions, the following dialectical illusions result.

In terms of Quantity, when did the world begin? How big is it? Use of understanding tells us that nothing can be infinite, so the world must have began at some time and must be bounded, IE, the question of the size and age of the universe must, one day, be answered. On the other hand, applying reason to objects, if time had a beginning, what happened previously? If space is bounded, what lies on the other side? This contradiction cannot be resolved unless time and space are considered as mere intuitions and not things in themselves.

In terms of the category of relation, and its subheading, causation, must everything have a cause? According to the use of reason, there must have been a first cause, an act of freedom. Understanding tells us that everything

must have a cause and without causation, nothing can be understood. Freedom cannot be understood through causation. Due to the phenomenal rather than noumenal (thing in itself) nature of human perception, science can never provide us with an all encompassing truth. Its a good time to think of the famous Keanu Reeves movie, “The Matrix”.

Space, time, causality must be modes of intuition and not things in themselves, if we consider things to be otherwise, we collapse into a dialectical conflict between reason and understanding. Our left (understanding) brain and our right (reasoned) brain think differently. We need a judgment to mitigate conflicting ideas, but what is truth?

The debate that characterized the philosophy of an absolute truth is now settled, its impossible. The mind is divided, on one hand we have understanding and on the other hand reason. This dialectic makes its way through morality and the judging of art and the sublime.

In his writing Kant is constantly using the terms “fact” and “right” which is the language of lawyers and jurists, not scientists. It suggests he was well read in enlightenment common law jurisprudence. In jurisprudence, there are two domains, fact and right. They define, as Kant defines truth as when fact and right are in agreement, for example,

In the case of Newtonian physics, right, or reason explains that gravity can be explained in a precise mathematical form, but in understanding, apples must actually fall from trees in all observations, without exception for it to be true. Newtons law is judged to be correct because the observations match the Newtonian law involving gravity. Fact and right match. Observations and pure reason agree independently. We don’t mix fact with right, but evaluate them separately to see if they agree.

Cops see you driving a car (understanding). For an arrest, there must be a crime, IE you must have violated someones right, by theft, or be violating the rights of the community, IE speeding. You must have or have had the car in your possession, not merely considered stealing a car in your imagination. There needs to be truth in both fact and right for an arrest.

If someone says they love (Fact) you, they must also respect (Right) you, otherwise, the word is meaningless.

Kant’s Critique of Pure Reason is an argument against pure materialism

and has the warning of how we can be mislead if we view the world as nothing but matter and energy. Our finite cognition cannot cannot conceptualize the world as it is, only as phenomenon.

Kant is not only the most respected philosopher in history, but also the most misunderstood. The two reasons for this are (1) his Transcendental Aesthetic and (2) his Categorical Imperative. The categorical imperative is a subject of the following chapter. Here we will address the Transcendental Aesthetic.

Kant is also the greatest philosopher of the subject of freedom and the free agency that is human, which makes him an opponent of anyone working toward a global autocratic dictatorship to enslave the human race.

Critical to this topic is the idea of an intuition. Intuitions do not come from knowledge, we simply understand the "what" in an intuition, but not the "why". An engineer or any other science worker can have an intuition from his knowledge but forget how that was explained and justified by first principles in school, or that which has been justified by years of experience without going back and deriving everything from first principles. This intuition required for the Transcendental Aesthetic is one that must be before knowledge.

The Kantian system of thought depends on the Transcendental Aesthetic, it collapses into nothing without it. Everything Kantian depends on the Transcendental Aesthetic.

It is this Transcendental Aesthetic that kicks off the Critique Of Pure Reason. It then goes into the Categories, then the Deductions of the Pure Concepts of Understanding, justifying the categories of objective perception, then onto a topic known as Schematism which gets us to the outer edge of objective perception, us having direct experience with objects. The Paralogisms (of empirical psychology) are next. These explain how objective perception through the categories must occur and the transcendental nature of the "I" and how it is misunderstood and oversimplified to fit in with our cognitive capabilities. These purely logical deductions are beyond the somewhat limited scope of this chapter and this book.

The Antinomies follow this and they are regarded by many as the most important aspect of the book because they demonstrate the very nature and

cognitive errors that occur as a result of extending our cognitions beyond the empirical and into the infinite.

The Transcendental Aesthetic states and proves that space and time are mere intuitions, both a-priori to any and all kinds of perception of objects in space and time.

To synthesize any kind of object in the mind as a phenomenon, we need external input as well as internal knowledge to complete the syllogism. Without the a-priori intuitions of space and time, perceptions of objects would be impossible.

Space and time are intuitions and not products of experience, and therefore do not constitute a concept of any form of knowledge. That they must be a-priori conceptions is the only way to explain the possibility of pure mathematics. The idea in geometry that a straight line is the shortest distance between two objects can never be proven, it is an intuition that is necessary prior to any knowledge of geometry, from the straight line comes the circle, and from more than one straight line comes shapes such as rectangles and triangles, all independent of empirical demonstrations such as with ropes and pieces of wood.

When one studies geometry in school, it isn't done with ropes and wooden pieces, it is done by a graphical construction on paper so the student can see the geometrical construct as an object and begin to fit it into categories, as nothing can be understood without the categories.

This basis for platonic forms such as cones, spheres, circles, rectangles, etc., perfect forms, would be unknown if their knowledge came from only empirical observation. The perfection of these shapes could never be understood if space and time were empirical experiences rather than a-priori intuitions.

Kant argues that because these are a-priori conceptions, prior to any experience they cannot show us the world as it really is. To some it may seem the opposite, that they do show the world as it truly is. There is an argument against this, but it is better demonstrated in the appendix. If geometry and math truly express the world as it is, everything would add up and it doesn't.

Kant's essential argument is that because space and time are a-priori

intuitions, they cannot possibly reflect the world as it truly is. If the world was how we see it in math, there would be no glitches in the matrix.

Does this make Kant an idealist in the Berklian sense, that everything could be merely a phantom of the mind? The recently late Henry Allison, one of the great modern Kantian scholars, says (paraphrased) “Kant’s Transcendental Idealism leads directly to Empirical Realism” in his book “Kant’s Transcendental Idealism”. Kant is the most realist of philosophers, as we shall clarify in the chapter on aesthetics.

The intuition and pure reasoning of Platonic forms has made science and the modern world possible.

Why is the Critique Of Pure Reason one of the most important books in the history of humanity? It shows that neither empirical observation or pure reason can lead us to an all encompassing truth. It is a vanguard against pure materialism as well as pure rationalism. It shows the human intellect finite and ultimately not containing the categories to discern an all encompassing truth, leaving room for faith. We are only finite discursive creatures and will never know an absolute truth. The categories give us the capability of understanding our everyday experiences with objects, and as we will see in the next chapter an absolute knowledge of only morality, in terms of virtue, respect and humiliation, all derived in pure reason from the “golden rule”

Chapter 4: Authenticity of Self

"You ain't got no self-respect, you feel like an insect"

Nick Cave & the Bad Seeds "Red Right Hand"

The key point of last chapter, as it applies to this chapter, is a single sub category of Relation, causality, and it being a category of mind that is part of what forms an experience involving the community of objects in space and time. Experience would not be possible without the sub category of causality. Everything having a cause defines our experience in the physical world of objects.

If we think of time and space as things in themselves we get dialectical illusions. No reason exists for us to believe the world exists as we see it, no warrant for this belief exists, although we live entirely within the envelope of space and time. Consider Aristotle and his world where friction always existed, so he never experienced friction as it is, because he never encountered its negation.

Could it all be just a computer simulation? or something else that currently lies beyond our imaginations? Are there limits to human cognition that prevents us from seeing the world as it truly is? The answer is an unequivocal yes, and will be explained further in the chapter on aesthetics.

This chapter will not change your natural judgment of good and evil, but it will, hopefully, convince you that freedom is at least as real as objects in time and space. It isn't an illusion. The chapter is to explain how we know that we are free and what that means. The content comes, once again, from the Sage of Königsberg as we expose an internal conflict, an Antinomy, felt by any finite rational free neurotypical agent in the self, called "original sin" in Christianity.

It is here, in the concept of freedom that we leave the phenomenal world and enter that of the noumenal, that is, only here we see things as they truly are. These ideas are independent of the intuitions that show us the empirical world in space and time. They are based on pure reason alone,

exactly like math. Moral objects are the subject of the chapter. Murder and theft are moral objects, just as triangles and straight lines are geometric objects.

Are the talking snakes wrong when they say freedom is nothing more than a product of imagination and that we are not really free agents? Is moral freedom any more chimerical than the laws of geometry?

Kant follows the path of reason, as did Christ when he said “I am not of this world”, as mathematicians do. The universal law of Christ is time and location (space) independent.

Christianity, like geometry has been open to further discovery, the development of a science that is based on reason, done through the Catholic church with its great thinkers such as St Augustine and St. Aquinas, as well as later Protestant thinkers such as the Sage of Königsberg, of which the ideas of this book are primarily based. Kant refined many of the ideas of St. Aquinas in his famous Summa Theologica. Christianity, unlike other religions, has an ontological basis, which is the objective universal law expressed in the New Testament. This is expressed in other forms such as Golden Rule and Original Writ.

Christianity’s primary spin off has been its influence on jurisprudence and the fact that Christians recognized the value of a good education for children so that they could understand logic, math, science, philosophy, partly just to comprehend the conceptual nature of Christianity and thereby strongly secure it, as well as recognize the fanatical dark cults that threaten it from within and without.

The Catholics and Romans started doing science as it pertains to right and wrong and Roman jurisprudence was the first thing ever called a science. The scientific method is a cross examination of a theory created by a scientist. The theory is tested before it can become fact, just as lawyers test a witness testifying for the opposing side. They seek to find fault in the testimony.

People aren’t getting the kind of education that creates thinkers today. They are being taught to be like machines, that we are just animals, and children are taught to conjugate each other rather than verbs, stunting their ability to engage in reasoned thought. In this authors opinion, a good education without the teachings of the fundamental science of truth,

jurisprudence, is an oxymoron.

Kant wrote The Critique Of Practical Reason, sometimes referred to as the Critique Of Pure Practical Reason. Pure practical reason is that reasoning that deals with the concept of good and evil, in other words, freedom. Without freedom there can be no judgment of good or evil. The remainder of this chapter is to give a summary of that work.

The concept of freedom is a concept that is purely rational, however, its laws apply to us, people that live in a real practical world, therefore its law is pure but its application is practical, exactly like geometry.

The desire to construct buildings using the laws of geometry is born out of wanting the building to remain standing. The desire for living according to the moral law is so that we can remain standing, hold onto relationships and live in a society that remains standing. The best way to ensure that we are ruled by tyrants is to not live according to this law as a society.

In the sense that geometry is perfect and true, no building can be constructed of perfect geometrical shapes, but those ideas guide the construction of buildings, the moral law guides our actions and makes us think of concepts like respect and virtue.

Without those a-priori conceptions of geometry, no one would be able to figure out the forces that operate on a building to design the building so that the construction would prevent the building from collapsing. Without the concept of respect, no one would respect laws and we would all be at each others throats, unable to co operate to have a society that can construct buildings and sciences.

In our buildings and sciences we strive to control nature, in morality we strive to rise above it, above our own natural inclinations, to create a sense of self respect and a self satisfaction. This is as necessary for our spirits as staying warm and fed is for our bodies.

Knowledge is deductive and must have some precepts. The subject of the earlier, physical world gets its cognitions from sense and intuition and Categories of Pure Concepts of Understanding that enable us to think and experience the objects in the physical world as a phenomenon – as an object in our mind.

The object must exist in the mind for us to experience it. Our discursive

and limited intellect uses the basis of the categories to begin to experience objects. Without these categories, experience and understandings of physical objects would be impossible.

It's a causal world, everything happens for a reason. There is no possible freewill, we are parts of a cosmic chemical reaction, everything that will happen has been pre-determined. Its a great big state machine, like a cash register, it gets its input and geared wheels spin until the total bill comes up. The bill total is pre-determined inside the machine and cannot change. In this physical world we live in, as we understand it through physics, there is absolutely no possibility of freewill.

There is the possibility of freewill in our actions, but these causes lie outside the range of limited human cognition.

None of those experiences give us a moral consciousness, that Holy Ghost of Christianity, the part of us that has a non transactional empathy for others and allows us to make moral judgments.

The physical world, the phenomenal world, is composed of physical objects and living organisms that operate by instinct (inclinations) to stay alive. Something else, external to the causal world gives us the spirit, the "I" that knows it is reading this book, the "I" that feels empathy for others, not merely knows that it must eat. It is one of the three irreducible forms: space, time and the "I", one of the three great mysteries of human experience, and the one of the greatest importance.

That "I" is actually a paralogism, when taken as a thing in itself, topic beyond the scope of this book. "I" is not based on logic because like transcendental space and time, it's a-priori and not predicated on anything else although we tend to think of it as one *thing*. It is an aesthetic, just like space and time. No one can really know what "I" means, just as no one can know what time or space really is. Rational psychology assumes the "I" and the model works, just as engineers use the model of the atom to explain the reality of substances.

What is this freedom? Kant's reciprocity thesis, as named by the late great Kantian scholar, Henry E. Allison, states that moral consciousness proves freedom and the freedom proves moral consciousness. This is implicit in Kant's evolution of the idea of freedom through his works. This freedom and moral consciousness come from that irreducible "I". Freedom

and moral consciousness are the same thing. We must be free to have moral thoughts, we must have moral thoughts to be free.

The Western conception of freedom is regulative and is very different from what many people believe freedom is – to do whatever you wish, without constraint. The Western conception of freedom is the moral law, it's Kantian, because it is based on freedom. Kantian moral and political philosophy (1797) give us deeper, not a different understanding of the earlier US constitution (1787). The US constitution, Christianity and Kantian morality are all similar, nearly identical and express our authentic being. This is why they are under attack by kings who wish to form collectives that operate in their own interest rather than in the interest of humanity.

It is contradictory to believe that freedom could originate from a physical world of space and time because this world is governed by causality, everything that happens has a cause. Its all just a big chemical reaction, everything that happens or will happen cannot be avoided, there is no concept of right, wrong, responsibility, virtue, humiliation or respect.

In freedom, the "I" is the cause, an inversion, a negation of causality in the physical world. We are free agents who's actions affect the cosmic chemical reaction in space and time. The freedom we feel is obvious but in no way can be deduced from the laws of physics, no more than one can obtain water from a stone. We create moral objects, we sometimes decide to murder and steal.

The regulative manifestation of freedom is frequently called the Golden Rule by philosophers, the Original Writ by jurists, the single commandment of the NT by Christians and the Categorical Imperative by Immanuel Kant. The categorical imperative is a little more nuanced than these ideas but its intention and moral meaning is the same, but really its just another attempt at the "original writ" that jurists called it, after giving up on finding a precise definition for the science of law.

Is freedom merely a chimera of the mind? Maybe, but no more so than geometry and arithmetic. Their laws can never be proven from observations of objects, they exist only in pure reason, just as the moral law.

To understand the categorical imperative, we must refer back to these categories which the moral law requires, but before doing that, I will illustrate the moral law and freedom with a few examples.

The first one is from Kant, another from the everyday life of screaming toddlers, another from psychology.

To quote from Kant's Critique Of Practical Judgment (Pluhar/Hackett),

"Suppose someone alleges that his lustful inclinations are quite irresistible to him when he encounters a favored object and the opportunity. [Ask him] whether, in the front of his house where he finds this opportunity, where gallows are erected on which he will be strung up immediately after gratifying his lust, he would not then conquer his inclination. One does not have long what he would reply. But ask him whether, if his prince demanded, on the threat of the same prompt penalty of death, that he give false testimony against an honest man whom the prince would like to ruin under specious pretenses, he might consider it possible to overcome his love of life, however great it may be"

For the next example, toddlers scream, it's part of childhood development and they scream for many reasons. Often it's because something isn't perceived as fair. They cannot manage their own inclinations but learn the word "fair" at an early age. They grasp the notion of fairness long before grasping the notion of responsibility.

A very cruel experiment would be to give one kid two candies, another only one. The experiment would result in at least a look of disgust at the giver of the candy from the child that only got one. A sulking and a justified anger bordering on hatred could result. The child that received two candies may feel guilty. Many would call it psychological abuse. If this experiment is done with chimps or gorillas, the experimenter could find himself torn to pieces.

Consider this example, you are standing line a line with a cup of coffee someone clearly accidentally bumps into you and spills your coffee. On the other hand, the exact same thing takes place although the action was deliberate. These are two completely different experiences. The one is merely an experience in space and time, spilled coffee interfered with happiness, something we experience in space and time and we forget. In the second experience we don't forget. If we are aware of evil then we are necessarily aware of its negation, the good.

For the final example, in practical psychology we have psychopaths and these are people that are genuinely known not to care and operate purely

by natural inclinations, without moral consideration. Because we have this concept of psychopathy, we also have its negation, the people that do care.

The next two pages will be a little analytical but the reward will be in the example, to explain and demonstrate these concepts, in a bar fight example involving a debate between a Kant and Nietzsche advocate to walk us through an example of exactly why all the following math actually works, as well as introduce the dialectic between virtue (respect/self satisfaction) and happiness that is been the source of controversy since the days of the Stoics and Epicureans.

The Nietzsche supporter loses badly and any neurotypical person will feel a certain empathy for him on this account. This is a non transactional moral empathy, once again proving freedom. On the other hand, you might hate Nietzsche, that also being an act of the free moral agent.

A law is an “is”, an imperative is an “ought”. In a casual world we can have an “is”, apples always fall from trees, you have to eat, this always happens, it “is” a law, but in the moral domain, only an ought is possible. One ought not to lie, cheat or steal. Ones duty is that they ought not to violate the moral law, this is why Kant is said to have a deontological ethic, it is a duty based ethic that this chapter will explain and justify.

We also have maxims, in addition to “is” and “ought” that are purely subjective, one could adopt a maxim, “no wrong shall go un-avenged”, but maxims often lead us to fanaticism.

The moral law is this: “So act that the maxim of your will could always hold at the same time as a principle of universal legislation”, something like “What if everyone did that?”.

This moral law leads to three versions of the categorical imperative. Just for the sake of completion, I’ve listed all three categorical imperatives, but the principle of the first one neatly gets us through this chapter and the fundamental idea. The other two can be forgotten, for the scope of this book, which is the self.

(1) Universal Law form: “Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should be universal law”.

(2) The Humanity form: “Act in such a way that you treat humanity, whether in your own person or that of another, always at the same time as an

ends".

(3) Kingdom of Ends form: "Never to choose except in such a way that in the same volition the maxims of your choice are also universal law".

In contrast there are hypothetical imperatives, an example being to always wake up early in the morning to exercise. An assertoric imperative would be something required, such as eating or getting dressed before going out.

So now, onto the "categorical" part of the categorical imperative, the categories of freedom.

In the empirical world of space and time, we perceive objects through senses and think them through categories, as substance, with size (Quantity), an inner quality (Quality), a substance and causality that is community (Relation), and they can be real or imagined objects in space (Modality).

Nothing can be thought or experienced without the categories. They apply to our perceptions of the true and the good. Nothing can be thought (discursively) without categories. In the absence of categories, we apply reflective judgment, the subject of the chapter on aesthetics.

In the phenomenon of space and time we can only know each of the subheadings for each category through another set of categories. Essentially we take the category of causality from the Pure Concepts of Understanding, as shown in the previous chapter, Relation, negate it to freedom, and we have another set of categories to understand this freedom, also as Quantity, Quality, Relation and Modality.

In freedom, causality is the first cause, we create the moral object rather than sense an object. We consider an action first, then its moral implications, so we create the reality which can then be interpreted through the categories of freedom and the moral law, before actually taking action, or in judging a previous action. We decide our actions. We create rather than sense our moral environment. This gives us knowledge of good and evil, which is fundamentally different from eating from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, or "pure legalism".

In both the categories of freedom and empirical experience of objects, there are mathematical and dynamic categories, the first two of the four being mathematical, the last two being dynamical. The first two are the

definable ofjects, the last two are in how they interact with other objects as well as our perception (modality).

These categories of freedom contain the same headings, Quantity, Quality, Relation and Modality.

Lets take a look at categories (1) and (3) of phenomenal objective perception, the physical causal world of objects: Quantity and Relation. We will go through these again in a little more detail before getting to the categories of freedom. Only two are considered, one mathematical, and one dynamical in the interest of brevity.

In objective perception categories, under the heading of Quantity we have the trichotomous subheadings of unity, plurality, totality. Under unity we could have an inch, under plurality we have 12 of them and under totality we have a distance of 12 inches, a physical quantity that can be observed in the phenomenal world. So where did the idea of an inch, or twelve come from? The unity of an inch requires additional categories to be understood, same as the others, like “12” and “12 inches”. The phenomenal world is made of endless syllogisms (turtles) and categories because our physical objective perceptions are based on phenomenon rather than noumenon. In other words, each of the subheadings of the categories can also only be understood as categories because nothing can be understood without categories.

The categories must be so for any finite intellect living in an envelope of space and time and so they apply for animals.

Imagine a bear, considering climbing a tree, he must consider the tree size relative to his own, or some other size before making the climb. Nothing can be thought without categories.

We understand good and evil through the same kind of categories. We have the Categories of Good and Evil. These categories end here, there are no more subcategories, in that sense these categories are different from the “turtles all the way down” categories of empirical experience.

In the world of right, the moral world, we see the noumenal, not the phenomenal, we see it as it truly is, no turtles.

Under the category of Relation, we have the headings substance, causality and community. We have a substance that is the object, but the

object just sitting there doesn't form a complete experience. It needs to be cause of, and caused by other objects in a community.

Notice that, for each category there are three subheadings because we must synthesize the phenomenal object in our minds and synthesis requires a syllogism. We have major and minor premise and a conclusion.

In the physical world we have the well known example is (1- major premise, understanding) All men are mortal (2-minor premise, reason/logic) Socrates is a man, (3 – conclusion, judgment) Socrates is mortal.

This also applies to the moral domain, although in this case the morality is questionable, but, for example (1-understanding or law) Angering the Gods is evil (2 – reason, Socrates acted as a free agent) Socrates angered Gods (3 – the judgment) Socrates is evil.

In the Categories Of Freedom, we have the same categories as we categorize causality as freedom (its negation) in the same way, we have the headings (1) Quantity, (2) Quality, (3) Relation, and (4) Modality. In this case we will examine only (1) Quantity, one of the two mathematical categories, and (3) Relation, one of the two dynamical categories, leaving (2) and (4) for later in the chapter.

In the case of Quantity, we have subjective acts, according to will, objective acts, according to principles and these two combine to give us objective and subjective laws of freedom. (you can't steal someone's wallet, you can have a beer after work)

In the case of Relation we have Personality (self, "I", "substance"), state of person (free or forced), and the third, reciprocity, a combination of the first two. Was the person forced to perform the act or did they do it under their own volition?

In the empirical world we have sensory data or phenomenal object → categories → experience. In freedom, we start with the free agency that is freedom, (created experience, hypothesis, should I…? noumenal object) → categories → "object", IE lawful or unlawful a-priori moral object, IE murder, theft, etc, **judged a-priori according to the moral law and as good or evil**. The categories of freedom are also called the categories of good and evil.

How we perceive moral acts is not only similar, but asymmetrical to

object perception.

In considering a theft, the theft is run though the categories of freedom and found to be evil rather than good, if the act was done in freewill and not forced. This morality is independent of what is actually done, where and when, time and space independent. Moral experience requires all four categories.

IE you kill somebody, with a knife, hammer or gun, does it make a difference? If you steal a wallet or watch does it matter? Does it matter who its stolen from? Empirical experience is irrelevant in judgments involving freedom and possible violation of the categories of good and evil because any law is universal, just by the virtue of being a law. A law, by definition, is something that is always true.

In construction of buildings, laws of geometry are used but they are quite separate from the actual buildings. No where in a building are the laws of geometry ever violated, although no perfect triangle, straight beam or circle exists in reality.

The moral law is that the law from which we use to make judgments through the categories, each of the categories of freedom must not violate the moral law.

*****

EXAMPLE A few shots at many people's favorite philosopher, Nietzsche (1844 – 1900), A moral experience through categories, good action vs bad action, regulative nature of freedom, dialectic between virtue and happiness.

Tom was sitting in a bar watching video of sports while music played in the right hand side of the bar where he had many friends. You could hear the cacophony of sounds created by colliding pool balls in the left hand side of the bar. Some of the laughter from that side could be heard over the music.

It was after lunch, the factory had shut down from a malfunction and everyone was happy to be paid into late afternoon to sit in a bar and pound back a few, relaxing with friends. Early factory shut downs had bought the bar owner a yaught and tips bought a tuition and few cars for the people that worked there.

A loud voice yelled out from the pool room, an angry challenging voice rang out “Did you just touch my balls?” The sound of cracking wood followed as it sounded like a pool cue being broken and made into a weapon. The sound of breaking glass filled the room. A pool ball rolled across the floor from the left and into the right side of the bar.

A rich and provocative discussion regarding the Categorical Imperative filled the room after someone yelled back to them from the right, “Asshole!”. One particularly handsome and astute member of the group insisted that asshole and categorical imperative belong to the same basic principle and that there is no recognized word that means exactly “asshole”.

He added “Its like a society of assholes lobbied to keep the word out of the dictionary.”

The discussion they were having was being heard in the pool room, and someone spoke up loudly with an objection.

A loud voice came from the pool hall at the left of the bar, “Well, Nietzsche said that that stupid categorical imperative was a singular act of cruelty, opposed to natural instincts.”. He stepped into the area of the bar where everyone from the right side could see him.

Tom’s beer started talking to him, letting his natural instincts run free in his mind. “That guy needs a sharp smack upside the head”, the beer said, but two big thick bouncers were starring right through him and right into the back of his head as if they had heard his thoughts.

“Discretion takes the better part of valor”, he thought, the beer voice quieted and the thought of smacking him floated away. Intuitively his subconscious mind considered the action through a table of categories but his beer muted the call and said something else. Categories are the only way of understanding a moral action just as they are the only way of experiencing an object in space.

Would it be virtuous for him to explain just exactly what was wrong with Nietzsche’s statement? He thought that he would like to and the attention would make him happy, but would it still be virtuous if it made him happy? What were his real inner motivations? Did he know? Original sin, or the dialectic between happiness and virtue is a key aspect of Kantian freedom, and we will get to it, but for now,

Tom decided to try and explain a few things to Dave, and the beer once again spoke. He yelled over to him, standing between the two halves of the room “Nietzsche was a filthy lazy minded communist” Dave got agitated and it looked like those two bouncers got agitated whenever Dave got agitated, and they were staring at him, still.

“Do you need me to defend that” he yelled over at Dave. A sarcastic tone carried the words from the left side of the bar “OK Lets hear it”.

Tom replied “You can’t live in a society and be ruled by natural instinct. If you want to live like an animal you should go into the bush and live off porcupines and dead skunks.”

“Do you hope that the guys who designed this bar used geometry when they designed this building?” he added.

He then added that Aristotle’s conception of justice made the most sense, to live according to ones nature and its not our nature to be at war with each other. Respect for one another is our natural inclination. Big hands, fingers and brains makes a thinking and co-operative creature that builds societies so people don’t have to live off of dead skunks and freeze to death in the winter. We weren’t built for war and unjustified war makes people crazy with PTSD.

An agitated group from the pool hall stepped into the light where they could all be seen from the bar.

Dave adds “Nietzsche also said it was a self tyranny”

Tom explains, “In reality it only demands that you respect the rights of others and yourself and that Nietzsche’s will to power is in direct opposition to civilized society itself.”

He added “Natural instincts, and Nietzsche’s Will To Power are the moral constitution of a three year old. Three year old’s need to be managed and cared for by their parents (kings).”.

So in the end, Kant is buried in a grave well maintained and visited to this day, as a tourist attraction. His funeral was attended by local dignitaries.

Nietzsche only sold a few books during his lifetime and died powerless, championed by his well endowed sister. One could say that he became popular when the world started to go mad with communist revolutions all

over the world, all through this last century. Communism, or Corporatism is the will to power for a ruling class. As we experience a mental health epidemic, its worthwhile noting that Nietzsche spent his fair share of time in the laughing academy.

The left side became visibly agitated, one could feel more insults swimming around in their heads, but the bar remained silent with everyone looking at Dave and Tom.

Dave spoke up. “Nietzsche said that the categorical imperative dumbfounded the common man.”. The bar went silent, being filled with common men.

The beer and the deafening silence compelled Tom to continue, “With regard to the moral ought that Nietzsche said dumbfounded the common man, how about this – I ought not to walk over there and smack you upside your head?”

“Perhaps you ought” a smirking Dave responded.

Tom looked over at the bouncers and discretion, once again, took the better part of valor,

So Tom said “One ought not to touch another mans balls.”

The group on the left went still, then quietly conceded the point while they nodded at each other in affirmation. They understood that there were definite “oughts” that were always the same, object independent, time and place irrelevant and that this particular law was universal.

Everyone, of course understood, that the evil act was not in touching balls, but the intention of cheating at the game. Cheating defeats the purpose of the game, a friendly social interaction where people practice a skill. Cheating negates the need for skill as well as the friendliness of the game. Everyone knows that if someone would cheat to win a game, they would cheat for bigger things. Someone caught cheating would naturally feel humiliation.

On the left they began to whisper to themselves, light laughter could be heard, they began to agree and Dave confidently spoke up as they continued light, confident laughter in the background “if Kant says that things in themselves exist but are unknowable, how can we know they exist?”

Tom responded “Have you seen the movie The Matrix with Keanu Reeves in it?” and then added “Like it or not, we know absolutely nothing about space or time, we only perceive the objects within as phenomenon.”. They started to get agitated again, having been so easily beaten. Dave spoke up again, not being one who easily gives up.

“Nietzsche said that the moral law was just Christianity in disguise, he needed the Christian god to keep his morality.”

Tom had to concede the point, but added that Kant’s deduction was in pure reason, agreeing with Christ, proving them both right. Dave explained that we have the moral law within, this tells us something exists independent of time and space. We do not have the moral law from a fear of God, we believe in God because of the moral law.

The left became visibly agitated once again, Dave started to walk towards Tom and walked right up to him, loud enough for everyone to hear, and said, with his right hand firmly grasping the bar stool “I swear” and he lifted his hand off the stool then slammed it back down to make his point, “I swear, on this very bar stool, I swear that I’m going to go to Königsberg, to the eternal resting place of Immanuel Kant, defecate on his grave, film it, and post it on social media.”.

Tom decided it would be better not to flog a dead horse and take Jesus Christ’s advice about throwing pearls before swine on this, and it was time to leave for home. He realized Dave needed to win in his own mind, that only the wise could be wrong.

The beer spoke to him once more as he was walking out the door, it whispered “Phone German authorities and tell them that Dave is going there and that he is asking uncomfortable questions about the holocaust.”. He thought that should keep Dave away from Kant’s grave for a few years anyway.

*****

So how could we determine that touching someones balls or defecating on a grave is a moral evil?

Lets first take a look at the grave defecation. This could have been beer talking, or it could have been the result of fanaticism, a hatred for Kant. We see this action all the time in the actions of the left, in the destruction of

statues and landmarks that show the history of America, before it was taken over by the United States inc. I'll quote Kant directly on this.

The following quote is from Kant's Critique Of Practical Reason, (Hacket/Pluhar) in the chapter "Incentives on Practical Reason" s. 85

(This is a complex quote, I explain the basic idea later in the second vignette, but this quote may give an idea of what it is like to read high level academic philosophy)

"By exhortation to actions as noble, sublime, and magnanimous, minds are attuned to nothing but moral fanaticism and enhancement of self conceit. For it leads them into the delusion [which makes it seem] as it were not duty – IE respect for the law whose yoke (which is none the less gentle because reason itself imposes it on us) they must bear, even if reluctantly- which amounts to the determining basis of their actions, and which always still humbles them inasmuch as they comply with the law (obey it), but as if these actions were expected of them not from duty but as bare merit. For by imitating such deeds, viz., deeds performed for such a principle, not only have they not in the least satisfied in the spirit of the law – which consists in the attitude that subjects itself to law, not in the lawfulness of the action (whatever the principle may be) – and are positing the incentive pathologically (in sympathy with or even in self love) rather than morally (in the law), but they produce in this way a frivolous, overreaching fantastic way of thinking. For they flatter themselves with a voluntary good nature of their mind – a mind which requires neither spur nor bridal and for which not even a command is needed – and thereby forget their obligation, of which they should, think sooner than of merit. Actions of others which have been done with great sacrifice and, moreover, solely on account of (moral, because it was the right thing in itself) duty, may indeed be praised under the name of noble and sublime deeds.."

In the times of the present people get respect for being committed to an action, whether or not it falls in line with the moral law. Fanaticism is now both rewarded and respected. To change consciousness in such deep and fundamental ways requires huge budgets and large research institutes acting over many years. Ex KGB communist officer, Yuri Bezmenov, has some of the most important political messages on the web.

The fanaticism isn't authentic because it isn't in line with our natural a-

priori sense of fairness. Oaths and Loyalties are usually benign until they ask us to violate this moral law and they exist for precisely that reason. To swear an oath or on a loyalty is to give up authenticity and become a means to another's end, violating the categorical imperative. This point was made by Samuel Pfendorf.

So now lets talk about the touching of the balls, did the action invoke feelings of humiliation or respect? In the case of respect, it would be from a respect of the a-priori moral law principle of fairness and completely against natural inclination - "the good". Humiliation comes from a loathing for an act, because it violated the moral law - "evil". This loathing drives gorillas and chimpanzees to tear each other apart when this moral law is violated.

The feeling toward the act, whether it creates respect or loathing for neurotypical people determines the morality of the act. No amount of education can improve ones ability to tell basic right from wrong. Common men understand it as well as Kant did because it is our authentic being.

Respect for the moral law is not holiness, for which the moral law is followed out of pure gladness rather than mere respect. Men cannot reach holiness because they are encumbered with natural inclinations. Men are motivated by both virtue and happiness, the final topic at the end of this chapter. Kant shows the Stoics and Epicureans both to be wrong, by making a fundamental error, that error being mixing the worlds of **Fact** and **Right**, which is a fundamental aspect of his philosophy.

Respect gets people to follow the moral law, a self respect or self satisfaction or the respect of others, in which case, it could be a faux respect, earned for happiness received from having the respect of others. No one really knows how they are motivated in the truest sense, we don't know ourselves.

Respect gives us self satisfaction but is not a source of happiness, because happiness comes in the physical world of space and time. Respect comes from the place of geometry, a place of pure reason. It is virtue that comes from respect and this virtue allows us to believe we deserve happiness. One who secretly loathes himself can never believe that he is deserving of happiness.

Admiration is sometimes confused with respect. We admire sports stars, musicians, mountain climbers, successful business people etc, but this

is not the respect we instinctively feel for people who act selflessly, such as war heroes or people who go to prison standing up for truth to be revealed. There are the famous athletes and movie stars, such as Wayne Gretzky and there are the Julian Assange's, Rachael Corries' and the Ursula Haverbach's of the world, and we see them differently.

The early Greeks thought of concepts like happiness, virtue and the highest good. In Plato's Republic, they search for justice, Socrates goes around asking various people what justice means. Perfect justice is to be seen as a saint but free to operate completely in accordance with your own inclinations, by wearing a ring that made you invisible. Then for public appearances, appear as the most virtuous, when taking the ring off. Be seen to be virtuous when not wearing the ring.

Undeserved respect makes neurotypical people uncomfortable.

The Stoics and Epicureans, (300 BC) Considered virtue and happiness carefully, but the Stoics got the closest and their formulation is almost the same as Christianity and Kant. Kant abstracts it further to explain Christianity better. The Christian handling of this issue is complex and is an aspect of Kant's assertoric proof of the existence of God, a subject for the chapter on aesthetics.

The Epicureans believed that if one pursued happiness that one would accumulate virtue in this process, not unlike a successful businessman considering himself virtuous just because he increased happiness. This is to be admired, but respect is a purely reasoned concept and has no connection to happiness.

The Stoics essentially got it close when they said that virtue itself creates the happiness.

Kant points out that happiness is the happiness of the **beast**, not the **spirit** that lies within, that the two were entirely separate, one was based in **Right**, in this case, the moral law, the other in the empirical world, the world of **Fact**.

Both Jurists of the time and Kant used "fact" and "right". Kant regularly used the words "fact" and "right" in the Critique of Pure Reason to separate the a-priori world of geometry and pure reasoning from the physical reality of objective empirical perception.

Virtue comes from pure reason, like geometry, Happiness comes from understandings, the physical world we all “stand under” in space and time, the world that tells us to eat, be warm, comfortable, have friends, family, etc. Virtue is about respect and self satisfaction in the spiritual sense.

The highest possible good was what philosophy has always searched for, the most supreme (unconditioned virtue) and the most complete (conditioned happiness). They didn’t not see that these were heterogeneous rather than homogeneous concepts. No philosophy could unite them in an analysis, they were oil and water in the absolute sense.

Mixing the water (**Fact**) with the wine (**Right**)creates muddy waters and muddy waters appear deep. This is known as a subreption. Those topics will be theosophy and idol worship and are outside the scope of this book.

The most supreme good is when one is happy and feels self satisfied in terms of virtue. Every free act carries with it a certain amount of inclination (happiness) and a certain amount of duty (virtue). The negation of respect is humiliation (loathing). Virtue in fact is admiration and is a form of happiness.

So now lets analyze the touching of the balls and take a look at the “Categories Of Freedom in Regard To The Concepts Of Good And Evil.”.

Moral judgments are normally instant. To make that judgment your mind must understand the moral objects through the categories because nothing can be understood without the categories.

So, here we have the Categories Of Freedom as they pertain to the touching of the balls.

Quantity

The subheadings are:

(a) Inclination: Subjective Maxims

(b) Duty: Objective Laws (the moral law)

(c) Laws: Objective and Subjective Principles of Freedom

The act of touching the balls came from inclination, not duty. There is no moral component in the act itself.

Contrast this with throwing an innocent drowning man a rope, which in itself does not generate respect, and comes from inclination, however, its omission would create loathing in the mind of any onlooker, the drowning man and later a subjective internal loathing “conscience” in the actor. The act would create respect only if it violated natural inclination, IE someone risks their own life to save another.

It is duty and its negative that create respect or loathing, the inclination and its negative that creates happiness or its opposite.

If the act was to murder, then the act itself would run contrary to duty, but the act of touching someones balls depends on the quality, the next heading of the categories.

Quality

(a) Inclination: Practical Rules of Commission,

(b) Duty: Practical Rules of Omission

(c) Laws: Practical Rules of Exceptions

Quality, the internal object, speaks to motive. Touching the other players balls was an inclination to cheat rather than an act of duty and violated a rule of omission, not to cheat at the game. This violated an implicit agreement with another agent, to follow the rules of the game.

Relation

(a) Inclination: To Personality

(b) Duty: To State of the Person

(c) Laws: Reciprocity (community)

The act was a free act and not forced. If the person was not in a free state, the act cannot be judged according to duty.

In older common law, it was the act of drunkenness that was the crime and it would get someone thrown in jail for the night. The loss of free agency would prevent a person from having to take responsibility for an evil act. Today, one drunk driver makes it home and he is fine with everyone, another causes an accident and is loathed. We all know that alcohol silences that inner voice and lets the devil be heard. In right, both drivers should carry the same amount of shame.

Modality

(a) Inclination: Permitted and Not Permitted

(b) Duty: What Is and What is Not Contrary to Duty

(c) Perfect and Imperfect Duty

Cheating was both contrary to duty and possibly an un-permitted inclination. So morally it was wrong, but was it categorically wrong?

To be categorically wrong, an act would have to be perfectly inline with inclinations and opposite to duty in all four categories, hence, “categorical”.

For each category we have three subheadings, one for inclinations (empirical world / happiness), one for duty to follow moral law (reason / virtue) and a judgment.

The Father gave us the ten commandments and the empirical word, but commandments aren’t followed out of fear. Everyone agrees that these laws would make happy societies. The father represents understandings and these values of the ten commandments are the basis for forming peaceful societies inline with the nature of men.

The Son brings in reason, to regulate sinful rulers, in that every action must be as to “love thy neighbor as thyself”, said to be the same as “love thy God with all thy heart and soul”.

The Christians were wiser than the Stoics and the Epicureans in how

they dealt with the Antinomy between Virtue and Happiness.

Aesthetics are all about how things look and how we make judgments independently of deductive reason and the Pure Concepts of the Understanding, the Categories. Deductive reasoning is for science, morality and law. Aesthetics is the world of the beautiful, sublime and of purpose and ends. Purpose and ends is where we turn to next and they are concepts of reflective rather than discursive (deterministic) judgments.

Chapter 5: Authenticity of the Aesthetic

"Bluesy Monday
Is the one day that they come here
Yeah when they haunt me
And they taunt me in my cage
I mock 'em all
They're feelin' small, yeah they got no answer
Yeah they're playin' dumb
But I'm just laughing as they rage

Don't arrange to have me sent to no asylum
Well it's only a game
I'm playing for fun
Yeah I've been trying to fool everyone"

Supertramp "Asylum"

Recall from previous two chapters,

In **Fact**: Sense Perception & Intuition → Categories of Understanding → phenomenal (created in the mind) Experience. Each subheading of these categories has its own set of categories – again and again – turtles all the way down. We see the physical world through reconstruction in our minds.

In Fact we know and think about objects (physics) and inclinations of the beast in a non freewill causally determined world. We don't simply choose to eat.

In **Right:** Created Experience, noumenal object (moral act) → Categories of Understanding- > (actual) knowledge of object (good or evil). Knowledge is absolute, no turtles.

In Right we think of morals (virtue, respect, humiliation) and geometry and these ideas come from pure reason alone, through the epistemelogical categories of good and evil, to be able to apply the moral law in the real world of objects. So the Critique Of Pure Practical reason has a practical (moral) as well as a pure (pure concepts of understanding/categories)

component. The consideration of an act doesn't make it evil. Evil or good only applies when the act is carried out.

Our free actions (**Right**) influence objects in the causally determined world of **Fact**. It is "Pure Practical Reason" that was the subject of the chapter on self.

All this stuff so far may seems trivial in the way that we lead our daily lives. It is, the stuff that is life that is depicted in the arts, theater, stories, movies & songs that matter, unless we have to make some kind of personal moral judgment, of course, which takes precedence over everything.

The Chinese have a curse, and it goes something like this "May you have an interesting life". It's better to watch a movie about a murder than to get yourself or a loved one killed, this way, you get the moral experience without the bloodshed and heart break. There is no other way to explain why people on TV and in movies get themselves into so much trouble. We hate it and like it at the same time, that poor bastard hanging from a cliff like that..what is the moral of the (for any beautiful or meaningful) story?

Kant's third Critique is a seminal work in both art theory and philosophy of mind. The stuff on art theory is some of his most comprehensible works and so I can't add any value to what Kant said about the beautiful and sublime. There is a depth to this, linking taste with freedom that I do not yet completely understand that adds to its surface level simplicity. It may be the topic of my next book.

Kant's Third Critique is said by many to be his crowning achievement. The book is divided in half, The first half covers the beautiful and sublime and what Kant calls the "Antinomy Of Taste".

The second half of the book, the part called the "Critique of Teleological Judgment" which is believed to be nearly incomprehensible, even after one understands the Critique Of Pure Reason, and Critique Of Practical Reason which were the subject matter of the previous two chapters. The Critique of Teleological Judgment is the subject of this chapter, and in today's language can be made much simpler.

The point of this chapter is to explain this book using metaphors and vignettes to set us up for Kant's proof that **"no man will ever understand the generation of even a blade of grass"**. We have to take a deeper dive

into the nature of human perception to do this, so lets start with the following vignette, in the spirit of theater, to wrap up some ideas of Kant from the previous chapter and to introduce some threads who's importance may not be immediately apparent. I want to ease you into this, *easily*.

*****

Tom had invited Dave over to his place to watch the game on his big screen home theater system. He had found a new respect for him and he had planned to carefully explain why he should never, ever, go to Germany, under any kind of circumstance.

He had found a new respect for Dave on another beer soaked Friday afternoon where Dave approached him. Dave told Tom he was right and that he understood the point now, to emphasized that, he explained. "Nietzsche couldn't have had that breakdown, been so sure of something, when he saw that man beating his horse unless he had that a-priori sense of an absolute right and wrong. It was a categorical evil that had knocked him into the laughing academy.".

Tom had invited him to sit down and explain further how he had come to this realization and that he had the deepest respect for a man that could admit he was wrong. The two talked over a couple of beers with group sitting at the bar and Tom invited him to come over to his apartment to watch the game on his new big screen / big audio home theater system.

They were sitting there, that afternoon, in Tom's apartment, across from the ball park, enthusiastically watching their team pummel the other side and cheering another touchdown.

This was a welcome relief for Tom, he had been a little depressed for a few days after he found his cat squashed by a dump truck on the road earlier in the week one morning on the way to work. Poor little Mittens had escaped Tom's apartment and could only be identified by his new flea collar. It was a sudden and painless end to an otherwise completely meaningless life.

Something suddenly smashed through Tom's curtain covered front window, shattering the window and overpowering the sound of the game. Dave looked at Tom, addressing him as our lord and savior. Tom, surprised for an instant, then said "someone hit a home run", thinking is was a baseball from the ballpark across the way.

They both got up and looked for the object in the broken glass that sat on the floor, mostly behind and around the drapes. The curtain maybe saved them and slowed down whatever this was. Dave found the object. It was a rock.

“You better call the cops” Dave said while Tom went to get a broom “Don’t sweep it yet, they will take pictures and you will need this police report for your landlord”. Tom was in a state of shock as he went to put the broom back in the closet and call the cops. He started wondering who would do it and why they would do it.

Dave asked him “what the hell?”. Tom replied, “I dunno” but after a few moments of silence said “I can’t think of anything except for this woman I saw last Saturday.”. Dave stayed silent and looked at him in a “what happened??” sort of way, Tom explained.

“I was walking around downtown last week after I found my cat and called in sick that day. There was this purple haired woman riding a donkey that would turn heads on a beach if she was wearing a Sunday dress. She was camel toeing black hot pants, wearing a light slightly sun transparent silky thin cotton strapped top and a six inch high pair of black stilettos, carrying little black purse with white skulls on it while riding around on that donkey.”. He paused for a moment, picturing it in his mind and went on “her silky smooth lily white....”

Dave interrupted “..Okay I get it, that was my sister.”

Tom, a little embarrassed, sought to justify his previous statements in a more virtuous light, “I looked around her and thought maybe it was some kind of show. After seeing it wasn’t, I looked up at her and, just for fun, wanting to compliment her on her ass, although...and she stared at me the way those two bouncers did at the bar that day when we were having that argument just as I was about to.

Not wanting to be kicked by a donkey, I ducked into the Moon Rise Coffee shop and watched her and her ass trot away around the corner with my face pressed up against the glass of the storefront window.”.

Dave replied. “I know, he went on, she is really something” Tom wanted to know more so Dave went on “She goes around like that with a little can of bear spray in her purse waiting for some man to compliment her

ass and then she then uses the bear spray as a weapon – a sort of feminist will to power.”.

“But my sister went back to school in Michigan on Wednesday, so it couldn’t have been her. So, anyway, what else could it be?”.

Tom pondered and explained he couldn’t think of anything while that phone call to Germany rang in his head.

To break the silence while they waited for the police, Dave decided to release the tension and started rambling on about the big chemical reaction to explain the inevitability of the incident, talking about the nature of reality itself, brain chemistry, carbon chains, evolution and finally going all the way back to rocks and dirt, saying everything was bound to happen and that this was the ultimate justification for the rock going through Tom's window.

Dave asked “Why did it all happen here in the grandest sense, isn’t that too much of a co-incidence given the universe is infinite?” Tom replied “Could it have happened anywhere else?” He added, as someone with a mere enthusiasm without the deep understanding for math would, “if everything depends on odds, in the infinite, everything that is possible happens.”.

They heard a loud knock at the door. It was the police. They came in, took pictures and got a statement from Tom and contact information for the both of them. They said they would file a report after having a look around. They left and went outside, Tom and Dave watched them through the second floor window as they looked around the property and began to make their way toward Tom's apartment.

Tom opened his door a bit so they could come in after hearing them coming up the stairs. They arrived and explained that they couldn’t find any other rocks, so it wasn’t people outside just throwing rocks around, there was only one rock and it was sitting in broken glass on the floor of Tom's apartment.

They would question possible witnesses by knocking on a few doors, file a report and for Tom to call them with the report number if he had anything to add, and leave the investigation open. They left and Tom started cleaning up the mess and Dave started talking about his sister, wondering why she was like that and why you hear women say stuff like “A woman

needs a man like a fish needs a bicycle.”.

Tom explained, “It all goes back to that dialectic between virtue and happiness. When one turns over to evil, such as in a fanaticism that places one above the moral law” he paused “Duty and inclination become the same thing rather than sometimes in opposition and one just loses self respect. There is no possibility of a virtue based self respect, no more dialectic.”. He thought for a moment and added “It’s the classic deal with the devil. It’s self love replacing self respect.”.

Dave went on about his sister “You know it’s a will to power for powers sake alone. A man’s will to power usually has a noble purpose, to look after his family, my sister just wants power for powers sake alone for revenge for us white guys, something she learned from these defective “universities” and defective “intellectuals” that push fanaticism as enlightenment. These kids think white men invented slavery and every known cruelty to women and were the only ones to ever use it.” then he paused and added “The great truth tellers of history.”

Dave started going into his research on UFO’s and how people directly or indirectly associated with the Pentagon were all saying they were real and that even crazy people knew they were real.

“It could have been a UFO”, he started and then proceeded to summarize some of his research on UFO’s. He explained: “Little green men from Mars are flying their saucers all over the place and only a few people are noticing, although evidence surrounds us.”. Tom was getting sick of listening to him and began to question the idea of warning him about going to Germany as Dave went on “I think they may have thrown a rock through your window, not as an act of anger but one of love.”.

Tom started to laugh but Dave went on, feeling himself to be somewhat of an authority on UFO’s, “I think you may have stepped on one of their men, unintentionally, and given that they are only a fraction of an inch tall, and the same color of green as the grass, maybe not even been aware of it. They would know that you did it, but also believe that you were aware of it because they are aware of everything, but also know it was an accident and assumed that you were sorry. It required an act of contrition”.

He paused to think for a moment “The Martians, being co-operative rational beings with a finite discursive intellect would also understand the

moral law.”.

He went on “On Mars, they don’t believe in punishment for accidents, but are well aware that a person who causes an accident may feel guilty and they wanted to alleviate your guilt, they do so by answering your deed with an insult, by custom. Their greatest of insults is to place a rock in your living space. So you must have stepped on one of their generals, but first they had to smash through your window with a flying saucer to get the rock inside.”.

Tom just looked at him disbelief, Dave sensing the tension began to explain further. “if you stepped on a corporal or a sergeant, you may find a dead animal in your yard or a giant bug hits your windshield, and this stuff happens all the time, you can’t deny it, you see it everywhere, all the time.”.

Tom looked at him as if he was nuts and said “Maybe the rock just threw itself through my window. Is that not possible? Maybe the rock is an alien rock that fell off a planet far far away?” Dave didn’t have an answer, he only reminded Tom that aliens were real and that even the experts said so.

He was getting sick of Dave. His only way out of this was that he was getting tired and needed to see about getting the window boarded up so Dave took the hint and went on his way.

******

Suppose no cause could be found, could the insurance companies call it an act of God and refuse to cover the damages? Could we say that it was an act of God and then use the unexplained event to prove that God really exists?

Deterministic judgments were covered in the first and second critiques, the subject matter of the two previous chapters. Reflective judgment is the subject of this chapter.

To get a clear idea of what deterministic judgments, or discursive reasoning is, lets take a look at Tom's window again. We know two things, we know the rock didn’t throw itself through his window and we know there must have been some acting agent to make this all happen, although not completely certain on this second point, its highly unlikely that it happened by accident.

The forces, masses and velocity and relevant forces that made this rock go through Tom's window are all understood, in a technical sense, the

foundations of this understanding can be traced back to Kant's Schematism and his Transcendental Deduction Of The Categories, in the Critique Of Pure Reason, the subject matter is slightly outside the scope of this book.

It is the goal of theoretical physics to tie everything back to these a-priori categories of understanding so that the knowledge is pure principle and not dependent on any particular observations. All of the mechanical laws of physics can be traced back to these a-priori principles and the mechanics of all of this are completely understood. All of it can be demonstrated by deductive reasoning, as Kant does in his "Metaphysics Of Natural Science.". Particular physical experiences can be explained by universal laws leading us to, in purely mechanistic systems, to understandings.

Deductive reasoning applies known universal laws to understand particular events. So we have Newtons laws, the universals, to explain the motion of the rock, the particular, all of which can be derived by a-priori principles using deductive reasoning. This deductive reasoning, when taken back to its most abstract form, requires the pure categories of understanding for a full comprehension of the phenomenon observed.

The same can be said for the agent doing the moral act of throwing the rock through the window. The purpose of the act may not ever be understood, except maybe at the top floors of our greatest psychiatric institutions, but the moral act can be understood in terms of good or evil using the same deductive reasoning, through the Categories of Freedom. Only a free act can be judged as good or evil.

The police in investigating the crime of this rock going through the window will collect evidence but not have a suspect for the crime. They will have no categories from which deduce who the suspect may be. They can't use deductive reasoning in their investigation because they have no hard principles from which to draw upon.

If my memory of the old TV show "Perry Mason" is right, the police will start with a reflective judgment, that they would look for a suspect with means, motive and opportunity, even though they know that there may be other possibilities, such as the rock falling off an airplane. They cannot deduce this notion from the event itself.

This principle will guide them in their inquiries. Suppose they find a

young woman from the local institute of higher learning, a “university”, who hates white people, hates men, and hates Christianity, and views herself as especially enlightened, and happens to know Tom fits all three of those categories? What if she was there at the time and has a baseball pitchers arm and could easily toss that rock up two stories through Tom's window?

This would not be enough to get an arrest, the police would still need to deduce that she committed the crime, witnesses to the act as well as physical evidence such as her fingerprints on the rock would tie her to the event conclusively. The reflective form of judgment may or may not lead to evidence from which a deduction can be carried out.

A kind of reflective judgment in physics can lead us to the equations that can be deduced from Newtons laws. This particular judgment takes a well known maxim of judgment in science, “nature always takes the shortest path”, formalizes it, and creates an analytical method for determining the equations of motion without using the deductive reasoning of Newton, and it makes it easier to derive the equations that govern physical motion, but it does not constitute a proof of these absolutes.

What makes math and physics “a-priori” is that those principles can be deduced ultimately from the pure categories of understanding.

Luckily these methods of an early woman physicist, Emily Noether can be used to get the same result. It also may be that the same result can be obtained using the laws of thermodynamics, but that too would be a reflective judgment that just works, not proving anything, thermodynamics being an observed phenomenon, doesn’t have the a-priori roots.

There is no fundamental theorem of statistics, but there is for arithmetic, algebra, and calculus, the maths that describe the behavior of objects.

I’m no physicist and many of them will tell you that the second law of thermodynamics is the root of all physics which means everything can be derived from it, but the second law of thermodynamics may or may not be provable from the pure concepts of understanding, it being statistical in nature. It may just be useful for theoretical (and practical)study. We are talking about Kant here, not the developments of physics since the early 1800’s, after Kant’s death.

So, we can use reflective judgment to create lines of inquiry that will lead to a reason that can be obtained deductively, and therefore understand the phenomenon. If this cannot be done, the subject remains an art. Kant always referred to chemistry as an art for precisely this reason, it is tied back to the periodic table rather than the principles of physics, although it can never violate the laws of physics.

In deductive reasoning, we observe particular events and look to universal laws to explain them. We use universal laws (in the case of the rock, velocity, mass & trajectories) to explain a particular event. We can explain the whole in terms of its parts and thus have knowledge.

We test hypothesis until we get something that fits. It's not likely that a rock fell off an airplane and went through Tom's window.

If we don't have any universals, we are stuck with looking for the universals that will explain the particulars, we look at the parts to try and explain the whole.

If we are looking for universals that fit we have the categories of pure concepts of understanding and its derivatives, such as laws of physics. We have the particular the category of causation. **Everything happens for a reason** and we can deduce the reason if we are to have an understanding, a science, rather than a mere art.

We cannot look at living objects using the same kind of cognitive tools we look at inanimate objects and machinery. Living objects will never be understood by man, in the words of Kant, "No man will understand even the generation of a simple blade of grass" ($ 77 Critique Of Judgment).

Living objects appear to have a purpose, in that they grow, they repair themselves and they reproduce. Purpose is entirely a concept of our minds. It has no a-priori component, it cannot be traced back to the Pure Concepts of Understanding. Purpose is only a maxim of judgment.

There are two fundamental ways of looking at the problem of life. There are the idealists and the rationalists. Kant didn't give the idealists much attention, merely calling their position absurd. But this isn't a book for philosophers so lets take a look at this idealist position first.

The idealist position is that life will one day be explained by the causal laws of physics, that life exists in a symbiotic relationship that can one day

be explained in terms of causal relationships (physics) alone. We have examples of symbiotic relationships to examine to clarify why this doesn't answer the grand question of purpose.

The symbiotic relationship that everyone is aware of is that between our international banks, fanatical churchmen, military industrial complex, the media and the "schools".

Each part of the system forms both ends and means for the others as well as for itself.

The fanatical churchmen motivate people for war, which the international banks depend on to enforce their otherwise worthless currency.

The military industrial complex depends on war so that investment opportunities are created for a ruling class through it. Its purpose is to supply weapons and make money for a ruling class which makes the ruling class happy with the banking system in its present form, they do not lobby for honest money, which would make war very difficult. They profit from all the wars and corrupt money. The media gets funding from the war pigs and "universities" are dependent upon grants from the same war pigs.

The churchmen create followers and a money making base that requires fanatics who must be unified and nothing unifies people more than a common enemy. Wars keep people praying and paying and all collectives need a unifying principle. The military industrial complex needs men to fight their wars. Men fight wars for God, or for the grand promise of being able to enslave and subjugate all of those not part of the inner group (Middle Eastern Religions). Its funny is a sense because kings are never going to hand anyone 600 slaves or 72 virgins. They will not fight wars so they can pay an income tax to international banks and have more wars.

If battles aren't evenly matched, someone wins, and the war ends. If they continue and are well managed, only the privately owned central banks win. Hence, Rothschild Christian Zionism, without which, the Jews would be squashed by the Arabs and the wars would end, ending the central bank economy and putting the war pigs out on the streets or in jails or asylums.

The existence of Rothschild Christian Zionism, which is antithetical to Christianity and its moral law governing principle suggests that an outside agency has been required to maintain the system. This becomes especially

obvious when we consider that the unifying principle of Judaism is to destroy all Christians and erase Christianity and the moral law, where Muslims only wish to tax, enslave and rape Christians.

The media and schools would continue to exist if the wars ended but in a different form ("truth telling"), one not funded by the international banks and military industrial complex.

Each organ is dependent on the others, collapse the fanatical churchmen and no men will fight the wars, the public won't support wars of pure conquest, God – or a shared booty has to be involved.

Collapse the military industrial complex, no more means for wars, no more war profits and no motivation to keep the privately owned central banks around. Collapse the private banks, replace them with national banks and the public would become very aware of the cost of war in real time.

Each organ operates for its own end while at the same time providing means to the others. Ends and means become the same thing. Each organ has a particular purpose, to earn money for its owners. The whole system works with another external purpose, for the international banks to gather more power and control. Each organ has its own purpose (profit and/or control of groups), that purpose is satisfied with this symbiosis. A different but grander purpose may or may not exist for the entire system.

The deep state needs muscle, brains, and a will to fight. They need an environment that supports the wars. So the armies and war pigs provide the muscle, the banks provide the brains and the churchmen create the will. The media and education system manufacture consent and even desire for the whole ball of shit.

This central bank / war economy requires an external purpose to exist. Without wars, it all collapses like dominoes. Without that purpose there would be no will to maintain the organs. It doesn't fix itself and would eventually fall apart if left alone. One could wrongly argue that it forms a beast with a will of its own but in reality, if there is no will within the organs themselves, the will is contained within the free agents that operate the organs of this machine as well as the master will behind the whole system that has shaped societies institutions toward this terrible end.

The system puts some people in a position to center their lives around

satisfying their inclinations rather than operating in a sense of virtue or earning for themselves a sense of self respect. The rightness or wrongness of it all doesn't get questioned or a false sense of right and wrong justifies it all, the prophets of the churchmen. All the other people, the simps, the slaves, operate for a purpose that opposes their own natural interest, the wars, and are thus controlled and people are prevented from acting as free agents.

In politics, when we elect representative, we are electing salesman for the whole show, not the show itself, which goes on independently of the politicians. You can't choose the car but you can choose the salesman (free elections). It seems like plans for societies are made by international banks and disseminated to politicians in secret meetings. They play no direct role in any of it and "leaders" are specifically chosen for their feckless and supine nature, and if they deviate from this they get killed. All of this is because the countries have gone bankrupt (1933) and the banks therefore take the position of true leadership.

The whole can be explained in terms of its parts, as long as we have an apparent purpose in mind (a reflective judgment), and the parts exist for the means and ends of the other parts. Each part has a purpose and the system as a whole has a purpose.

It's not unlike a house for rent, the example provided by Kant in which the house collects rent which in turn maintains the house. The house is both ends and means and so is the rent. But there is the will of the landlord who created it, there is no purpose in the house or the rent money collected, only in the agency of the landlord. Unlike in a living organism, Tom's window has no purpose within the building itself and will not repair itself.

In the case of a franchised business, there is no will between franchises to create additional franchises. That will comes from an external agency and has the purpose of increasing profits. No business ever operates by itself, an outside agent is required for repair and maintenance as well as to adjust for external circumstances. People get suntans when the sun gets too intense, small cuts heal by themselves, broken bones heal by themselves.

The realist, by contrast, recognizes the need to explain the concept of purpose in living organisms.

Each organ exists by a means but is directed toward the end of supporting all of the other organs. The organs came to be with an apparent

purpose that cannot be explained by the mere causation of non living objects in time and space.

In the case of the deep state, the churchmen, the military industrial complex and the banks, who could prove that this symbiotic system did not form organically, or did it? It could be that the independent agents operating these arms are part of a larger system that formed organically, independent of any intentionally acting agents. Never the less, each organ does operate with an apparent purpose and therefore has agency.

One could argue that the Christian churchmen are in no way educating Christians of the dangers they face from Middle Eastern Religions, but rather teaching their parishioners to worship this opposing religion that absolutely hates the moral law because it is in conflict with the doctrine that unites them and makes them useful to their kings. They are not being educated about the Crusades (a reaction to a genocide) or the recent Bolshevik Revolution (a genocide of 20 – 60 million Christians), both of which were a direct genocidal attack on Christianity by kings who also hate the moral law. Hollywood isn't making movies about the Bolshevik genocide, although there are virtually endless movies about the holocaust.

The idea of intentionality of this deep state can only be used as a maxim of judgment, a doctrine that lets us identify patterns that may be later identified by a known causation.

The same can be said for theories of life such as evolution. They can only create maxims of judgment to guide theories that can hopefully lead to an explanation based on causation, or govern a look to the past to prevent impossibilities from forming part of a hypothesis.

This idea goes to the formation of forests, living creatures considered by themselves, the notion of sexual reproduction which is another great leap that is independent of an organism maintaining itself and existing for its own end. Can causation ever explain sexual reproduction? – creatures have to have this instinct, do the act, and usually not kill each other afterwards.

This brings to an Antinomy of Teleological Judgment:

(1) The world operates by cause and effect, everything that happens has a cause.

(2) It appears that some things operate according to a predestined end, which negates a purely causal basis. We see this in the formation of life.

Events can only be explained by human cognition through causation and this is the root of our understanding, a category in the pure concepts of understanding. We have no other category that could explain life, and we do not need it to protect and maintain our own lives as well as the lives of others in our community. Humanity is not infinitely wise and will never become infinitely wise because (1) We don't see the world as it truly is (2) Our cognition is limited to the Pure Concepts of Understanding – we can only understand things in terms of cause and effect. Any other understanding is incomplete and called an art or a technique.

The notion of a purpose to life can only act as a maxim of judgment and it leads us to many fruits. If a biologist is conducting an autopsy of a newly found creature, he will apply the maxim that every organ within the body has a purpose and this maxim of judgment will protect him from arriving at theories that cannot be true. His inquiries will always be regulated by this maxim of judgment. No organ within the body can remain unexplained.

The conflict is resolved by considering a reason outside causation but only as a regulative principle. This notion comes from pure reason, which has no principles of its own and operates in a purely regulative sense. Principles come from the faculty of understanding. Reason can tell us what cannot be true, and in doing this, lead us to form maxims of judgment to establish guidelines for giving us principles which can be derived from the Pure Concepts of Understanding.

Understanding gives us the rules of logic and math, reason gives us the guidelines for exploring and learning. Only the faculty of reason can detect bullshit and this will be shown in the appendix on examples and possible explanations of insanity brought forth by others.

Of all the creatures on the earth, man can only be aware of his own cognitive limitations (*only some of us*) and understand a concept called wisdom, necessary for the agency of self determination as well as wisdom to

be employed to preserve the species (a topic in Kantian works beyond the scope of this book), as a natural sense of purpose. Other creatures are purely reactionary and appear to serve the purposes of mankind and can be controlled by mankind for his benefit.

This idea of an external causation, outside the notion of pure cause and effect forms a **hypothetical proof of the existence of the Christian God**, in pure reason alone.

Principles for preserving the species and increasing human happiness is the sole reason for Christianity.

The determination of this notion through regulative judgment means that it cannot be a constitutive religion that commands unconditionally. It is in principle purely regulative and its basis is the moral law – **Christianity is the moral law**. Its doctrines are a logical consequence of this moral law.

Now for an assertoric proof of Gods existence and as well as the impossibility of an apodictic proof. This assertoric proof of immortality is given in the Critique Of Practical Reason.

There is a dialectic between virtue and happiness, happiness is the need of the beast and virtue the spirit within. Reason demands a unification of principles and we expect the unification in the afterlife as “heaven”, where inclinations and virtue unite in a further greater principle that is also beyond our cognition as earthy creatures. Christianity says that Lucifer rules this world. Lucifer can remove the dialectic when virtue and happiness become the same thing, all inclinations become virtues, all for the loss of self respect, a selling of the soul to the devil, a *falling*.

The non transactional empathy that we experience, a conscience, can only be explained and justified by a freewill that exists outside the causality that explains the behavior of inanimate objects. This is an assertion of a spirit that exists outside of space and time and is not limited by our intuitions of space and time and suggests a possibility of an immortality that will lead us to a world where virtue and happiness become united in a higher principle, beyond the mere cognitions of the beast as necessary for life and survival.

Kant was not a Catholic, and didn’t like Catholicism but the Catholic developed Trinity is a parallel expression to what Kant called ***God,***

Freedom* and *Immortality in the Critique of Teleological Judgment. Note the Catholic Trinity is the ***Father, the Son and the Holy Ghost***.

Immortality is a parallel statement to the holy ghost, which operates according to the moral law and is space and time independent. As we age, we remember our moral transgressions and are sorry for them, and we learn to live with regrets but those regrets never disappear.

The Catholics also developed the concept of ***Original Sin***, which is expressed by Kant as this dialectic between virtue and happiness that makes every human being a born sinner. It is the son that brought this reasoning and the concept of grace.

The concept of ***Grace*** applies to a person with a moral goodwill, forgiveness isn't automatic. Kant talks about the nature of punishment and how it sets a bothersome conscience at ease. People who receive punishments often view them as fair.

The concept of a creator gives us the ten commandments which are necessary for humans to live in peace, increase their numbers and have peaceful societies. The Christian religion only commands war as a means of self defense. Christianity has always been spread by the word (world wide missions) as opposed to the sword.

A churchman can no less destroy the doctrines of Christianity any more than the behavior of a mathematician can destroy mathematics. Christianity is defined by its doctrine and its modern churchmen explain the doctrine, not create it, except in very rare cases of sages, such as St. Augustine. They are to Christianity as mathematicians are to geometry. No action of a mathematician can destroy the logic of math. No action of a Christian church man can destroy the doctrines of Christianity. In Christianity, even churchmen are considered sinners.

There is Churchianity and there is Christianity. There are mathematicians, who have been wrong, and there is mathematics.

PART 3

Chapter 6: Authenticity

"That's me in the corner
That's me in the spotlight, losing my religion
Trying to keep up with you
And I don't know if I can do it
Oh no, I've said too much
I haven't said enough"

R.E.M "Losing My Religion"

We are losing our concept of what it means to be human, to be an authentic human being who's sense of justice is in line with our conception of what and who we are. We are social and co-operative creatures.

It may be and likely is that we as humans are too complex for us humans to fully understand, but this does not negate the possibility of knowing some universal truths that apply to all human beings as a species.

This does not prevent us from having a definition of sanity, which, if I have made my case, is Christianity. Living by Christian principles assures that we all get along and build peaceful societies. The empirical evidence of the success is the growth of Western society and the models of architecture that took generations to create, the Catholic churches, for which nothing else comparable has ever been built, and were built mostly by volunteers. Inside communities people believed Christianity to be their saving grace which motivated farmers in the off season to volunteer their time in providing the labor to build churches over generations because they stood for an eternal truth of spirit.

While Christians were building great and beautiful churches to spread sanity and sense, other religions have been practicing and developing methods of sorcery to keep their members under control and serving their kings, making their followers dependent on kings for respect and virtue,

rather than their own innate consciousness or conscience.

No sect of the Christian religion has stood in opposition to this fanatical world government more than the Catholic church. It is an agenda that Kant was aware of (see Religion Within The Bounds Of Reason) *but he also believed that it would never stand up through time, that it would fall apart because of its opposition to human nature, no one would fall for it was his essential explanation as to why he didn't concern himself with it.*

This is why the media reports any moral transgression by any Catholic clergy member all over the world, but we never hear of these things happening in Islam or Judaism. Raping children is not forbidden in these groups, which prevents these moral transgressions from becoming newsworthy. No scandal, no news.

The worldwide reporting of the transgressions of only Christian clerics shows the inherent goodness of the religion, its openness and its honesty. No one, as a Christian, is without sin. Kant's objection to Catholicism was that Catholicism commands that no man be called "father". Catholics call their clerics Father, to the objection of Protestants. On the other hand, Protestants have been captured by Rothschild Zionists and Rothschild Zionism is antithetical to Christianity. Only crude misinterpretations of Biblical text can justify it. Nothing can justify the willful transgression of the moral law.

Christianity has taken two big hits, one being the demonization of the Catholic Church and the mainstream cartoonish view of the Crusades. The other is the absence of the single commandment that defines Christianity from the minds of Protestants, when Israel is considered.

Christianity and a world dictatorship are diametrically opposite. One demands juristic (common law) societies, the others all stand for ethical (based on desires of a ruling class) societies. Mankind must be led by his "betters". My other book "The Asshole Problem" explains why ethical societies promote and empower assholes and juristic societies tend to lock them away in prisons or asylums. The word for one who violates the moral law is "asshole" and there is no synonym for it in the dictionaries.

For this book to make sense, the following lemmas must be part of the readers consciousness.

Lemma 1: Humans are naturally peaceful and co-operative by nature

Lemma 2: Justice occurs when a creature operates according to his own nature

Lemma 3: Peace is only possible in a world of objective, universal law

Lemma 4: All men are sinners – no one should receive a blind trust.

Humility (understanding our cognitive limitations) and moral law is justice. Authentic a-priori human experience is in humiliation, respect and virtue.

There is a controlling oligarchy who seeks to break our spirits and make us into useful objects rather than people, a sub class who never questions and is happy to do the work, a form of livestock. For this, our spirits have to be broken and our knowledge of three absolute truths: virtue, humiliation and respect must be destroyed. The notion of a self respect can only come from freedom and this must be removed from human consciousness.

The purpose of the lies we have been told is not to get us to believe them. Anyone can investigate any of the modern myths, from why World War Two was started, and why it was fought to the truth of vaccines in general and the Kovid virus in particular, and everything in between. The truth is out there for anyone who wishes to look and its is crystal clear for anyone who dares to look.

There have been massive lies of omission. While perhaps one hundred Jewish holocaust movies have been made by Hollywood, not a single movie about the Bolshevik genocide of Christians has ever been made. During the last century, between 20 and 60 million Christians were buried alive, burned alive, tortured, raped, shot, stabbed or tortured to death. The fact that Hollywood has never made a movie about this, yet still makes movies about the holocaust tells us a lot. The Bolshevik revolution is not taught in Western schools because the Bolsheviks are still in power.

Getting people to accept the lies given to us is a form of humiliation, to break our own sense of character, to break our spirits. It destroys notions of respect, humiliation and virtue. Once these values are destroyed we become controlleable, creatures who operate exclusively from natural inclinations,

who have given up any sense of virtue in return for creature comfort and a satisfaction of the inclinations. Creatures that operate purely from natural inclinations will never object to anything, never stand for anything, as long as they are comfortable, they don't care.

These kinds of moral transgressions that accompany a loss of character have mental illness at the root, so the system finds and promotes people with mental illnesses and have arrogance, greed, or deviant sexual desires because they are easily controlled.

The Cremation Of Care is a yearly gathering attended to be elites which Alex Jones exposed.

The acceptance of the world government agenda is the one thing Kant was wrong about, the world government agenda grew after his death. This worldwide communist agenda is likely why so many people have never heard of, or know little about, the Sage of Königsberg.

Some possible reasons that may be motivating our kings to create this world government. The one we have been warned about in the Jewish Bible is the Tower of Babel story. In this story, God created the nations and different languages to prevent a world wide agenda to create a king of mankind.

Possible motivations are outlined in the following paragraphs.

In philosophy the concept of negation is often used because we can really only know things by what they are not. To truly understand and comprehend the good, one must experience evil. Otherwise it is only a passing interest, an interest in philosophy, one to get credit in school, work in jurisprudence, or to preach to a congregation who goes to church for many other reasons other than enlightenment.

George H.W. Bush once said that his neoconservative movement would set minds on fire. Neo-conservatism and it's elitism, along with Neo-liberal elitism created gardens that seem to be made to grow corruption.

Sometimes I wonder if the evil that has been slowly enveloping us is to give an awakening, one necessary for humanity to live in a world of artificial intelligence, an enhanced consciousness of good and evil that a comfortable population could never achieve. It maybe so that we can become authentic again, in thinking about good and evil, rather than be

simply placated with pleasure and comfort by machines.

It maybe that kings can have every kind of luxury and experience except for the experience of having sex with children. Christianity is the only Abrahamic religion that forbids slavery and has a clear doctrine of freedom. For this forbidden fruit to be widely available, Christianity must be eliminated.

We may have malevolent kings, who wish to kick start humanity all over again, a big "reset" in the Antarctic, where now, no one is allowed to go. A malevolent king may have selected and bred the top mathematicians, acrobats, and poets to create a new humanity, already bred through several generations as this world destroys itself under the Cremation Of Care and its lack of authenticity.

Any way you slice it, whether its based on pure greed or something higher, the worshipers of Heshem and Allah have kept the war pigs in business and created massive concentrations of power and wealth, as well as the intellectual, spiritual and psychological impoverishment of the masses of the world.

Wars create totalitarian governments.

The system punishes people who wish to hang onto their authentic natural Christian identity. This could all be trial by fire. This war on free speech is an attack on authenticity itself. Our natural authentic identity is Christian.

How is it that this is being allowed to happen? The best explanation I know of is the well known book "Political Ponerology" by Polish psychiatrist Andrzej Łobaczewski. This book does not suggest that the ultimate kings are actually crazy, only the talking snakes we see as leaders, commentators, etc. are crazy, and they hold those positions of visible leadership precisely because they are crazy, not in spite of it.

Political Ponerology argues for grace to be applied to most of the conspirators, a view of which I happen to agree with. I'm not a rich man and the opportunities presented to these powerful people have never been an option for me. It may be that under peer pressure I too would take elicit drugs and be lead into moral transgressions which I would never otherwise consider. Many are likely the victims of sophisticated brain washing and

propaganda techniques, of which there is not one of us that is immune.

During the course of writing this book I have been reading Iain McGilchrist's book, "The Master and His Emissary", a very well received book that is the subject of numerous interviews with the author on YouTube. The book, as being related to this subject matter, I am now on my third read, the one when little notes get written in margins beside earlier notes for the definitions of terms.

McGilchrist has a PhD in English literature and was a fellow at Oxford, he later went to med school and specialized in psychiatry. Impressively, he knows something about both art and science which is very rare. It's a big thick book with a big thick section for references and is being very well received and generating lots of interest far outside the authors initial expectations.

McGilchrist points to experiments with left brain injured and right brain injured people to draw conclusions about the function of each brain half, an idea that was discredited earlier because earlier ideas were shown wrong. He claims that the idea that the left and right brain do perform different functions is in fact correct and that earlier investigators were wrong in the way the hemispheres operate operate. They seem to be in direct line with Kantian thought to me, although I am no doctor.

There are some hard conclusions that can be drawn from this book. The law, as it is known and argued in courts, is a left brained, instrumentalized system. It understands and is rational and rule based. Morality sees the bigger picture and is right brained, reason based. Only the left brain knows hate, only the right brain detects bullshit, something detected by a reflective judgment. Only reflective judgment, a concept of reason can ask: "is that really possible?".

The left brain knows things that the right brain doesn't and visa versa. There is no section that makes judgments. A mass between the two halves, called the corpus collosum, regulates and restricts information moving between the two halves and thus one half is dominant in making a judgment. The left brain deals with disconnected objects and rules, the right brain sees life, and the big picture.

McGilchrist says that the left brain gives us the map, the right brain gives us the terrain.

The Trinity is a subject of philosophy of mind, not neuroscience, and its not surprising the word is never mentioned in the book, although distinct functions of understanding (McGilchrist calls this rationality), the left brain, and reason, the right brain can be shown. Kings really don't like the Trinity. It may be that writing about the Trinity is forbidden at the highest levels of academia.

The same thing can be said for the works of Immanuel Kant. He explains the dialectic between reason and understanding in the first Critique, explains how reason gives us morality in the second critique and how both reason and understanding play a role in our judgments regarding the beautiful and sublime in the first half of his third Critique, the Critique of Judgment. He says little regarding the Trinity in his "Religion Within The Bounds of Mere Reason" but does point out that every culture has one.

I would find it hard to believe that neither Kant nor McGilchrist hasn't read Augustine on the Trinity. Kant was certainly censored by his king and if McGilchrist said the wrong thing, he would be behind bars rather than being a popular intellectual on YouTube. The Trinity is a theological concept, a faith, but it is also logical, being theo-logical.

Kant does, however, lay out the trinity, as translated by Paul Guyer and company, in an edition of Kant's Critique Of The Power of Judgment in the Cambridge Edition Of The Works of Immanuel Kant as follows (sect 20:202), my additions in [].

"But now if the understanding yields *a-priori* laws of nature, reason, on the contrary, laws of freedom, then by analogy one would still expect that the power of judgment, which mediates the connection between the two faculties [reason and understanding], would, just like those, add its own special principles an a-priori and perhaps ground a special part of philosophy even though philosophy can only have two parts [reason and understanding]**"**

McGilchrist uses rationality and reason as the two terms, understanding and reason.

So what happens when something goes wrong with this thought process that employs both reason and understanding? The following is a poignant example of this that will echo with those who have been frustrated when arguing with AI bots and simps online.

Taken from McGilchrist's book, in the chapter entitled "The Primacy Of The Right Hemisphere":

Take the following example of a syllogism with a false premise

1. Major Premise: All monkeys climb trees

2. Minor Premise: The (non arboreal) porcupine is a monkey

3. Implied Conclusion: The porcupine climbs trees (IE is arboreal)

Well does it? As Deglin and Kinsbourne demonstrated, each hemisphere has its own way of approaching this question. At the outset, when the intact individual is asked, "Does the porcupine climb trees", she replied, using both hemispheres, of course, "It does not climb, the porcupine runs on the ground and is prickly, it's not a monkey"....During experimental temporary hemisphere inactivation's, the left hemisphere of the very same individual, with the right hemisphere deactivated replies that the conclusion is true: "the porcupine climbs trees since it is a monkey". When the experimenter asks "but is the porcupine a monkey?", she replies that she knows it is not. When the syllogism is presented again she is a little nonplussed, but replies in the affirmative, since "that is what is written on the card". When the right hemisphere of the same individual (with left hemisphere inactivated) is asked if the syllogism is true, she replies ""How can it climb trees – it's not a monkey, it's wrong here". *If the experimenter points out that the conclusion must follow the premise stated, she replies indignantly: "But the porcupine is not a monkey!".*

The "terrorist" attacks of 9-11 are a perfect real world example of this. Common sense and experience tells us that a great deal of planning by demolition experts is required to collapse a building neatly into its own foot print, but when told by the talking snakes of the networks what to think, people may as well not have a right brain. The official version of the events of 9-11 tell us that airplanes crashing into buildings can cause, what appears to be, a perfectly executed textbook example of a controlled demolition.

How often have we been arguing online with right brain damaged people? How many characters online are AI bots, unable to reason but only exercise understandings? One way to find out is to express your statement in

terms of a metaphor, the bot will take the metaphor as a factual statement. McGilchrist explains that only the right brain can process metaphors. The only kind of intelligence AI can have is the artificial left brained intelligence, but it may be able to fake metaphoric understandings. It has the map but not the terrain.

Suppose you are accused of a crime, your lawyer puts up a defense, but the jury is composed of right brain injured people (who actually make the guilt/innocence judgment) and the prosecutor has deduced by syllogism that you are guilty, and you were not even at the place and time where the crime was committed? How many right brain injured people are out there? How many are running the system? The aforementioned book, "Political Ponerology" suggests that bureaucrats and rulers with this deficit, called characteropathies, more easily fit into the system.

The root of evil in the West has been the monetary system, in the words of the great economist, J.K. Galbraith in his "Money: Whence It Came; Where It Went", written in the seventies, describes it as mind warping. Private banks print money from thin air essentially and then lend it to governments at interest, with no obligation to anyone. The very idea or thought of this must create cognitive dissonance. Numerous monetary reform books and videos have been made over the past generation, a more detailed discussion is beyond the scope of this book.

The income tax on wage labor is well known violation of the laws against slavery, but why is this? Many people have written much about how to escape paying this immoral and unjust tax, but have skipped over a simple aspect of Western law in doing so.

They file all kinds of paperwork as if they are in a commercial court which is governed by the Uniform Commercial Code, the UCC, which evolved from early merchant law and is the subject matter called the Law Merchant. The Law Merchant dealt with chattel and commercial law.

In reality only commercial entities owe an income tax, because only commercial entities can have an income. The banks protect commerce through persecuting counterfeiters and coin clippers as well as keep sea lanes and highways safe from pirates and highwaymen. This is necessary for the protection of commerce and a tax must be paid.

A wage earner simply trades his time for money, he earns no profit, has

nothing that is an actual income (profit) and therefore has no obligation to pay income tax. The money that funds the war pigs is the income tax on wage labor. Talking snakes, the income tax collection revenue agents, will tell you it keeps the lights on but the reality is that it keeps the war pigs in business, anxious to export their income tax and collectivist ideals all over the world.

Private banks and their private collections agencies masked as government entities collect this income tax on wage labor and use it to destroy Christianity and control the minds of the masses through propaganda organizations such as Tavistok and the Pentagon.

The serpent, the fork tongued devil, the talking snakes, all feed off the income tax and they are everywhere. If you don't want bears on your property, stop putting honey in your yard. There is no other way.

Before closing off this book, I want to leave a few thoughts about St Augustine and his Trinity, as well as a solution to all of this, which has stuck with me after reading it a long time ago.

What are the limits of mans capacity to conceptualize God? The most complex thing in mans experience is himself, there is no other way to consider God as existing other than having characteristics that define him, as a concept, or an idea, unless God is to be considered as a lower life form, such as a mouse or a dolphin.

If we see a painting, but without the painter, how else can we consider the painter, except through the painting? Can we derive any truths about the artist from the painting? We can certainly say that the artist wanted the painting to exist and for it to last, to be seen, and be considered. No other reason for an artist to make a painting. No other reason for a gardener to create a garden.

St. Augustine said that man is tripartite: memory, understanding and care. These are better expressed as understanding (or rationality), reason and judgment. Care is required for judgment, we don't make judgments when we don't care. We therefore see God as Understanding (Law), Reason and Judgment, The Father (the understandings – laws), the Son (Reason) and the Holy Ghost (the care that leads to judgment – St. Augustine was talking about conscience). Our perceptions and cognitions are limited, we this see God through a stained glass window, as an enigma, the Father, Son & Holy

Ghost.

We have only been visited by the son, when we needed it, when men started to become Gods.

Our societies are central bank / war economies and cultures. We watch and glorify movies about war and a purpose of war may be to create a culture that essentially worships something that is absolutely contrary to the natural human spirit.

How do we replace it? ***The answer is astonishingly both simple and complete.*** We use sport to replace our war culture, I mean real sport, where your friends, neighbors and relatives actually play on the team of your city. War drives technology, which increases comfort, not meaning to life. For most people, a life centered on sport would make them happy and give them a sense of purpose. Local athletes rather than drug addled and perverted movie stars would be the example for the young and it wouldn't be anything as expensive as warfare is to the economy. People would work less, play more, be happier, use fewer drugs and develop further, in mind, brain, body and spirit and live longer happier lives. ***A sport based culture and society would make men better rather than more comfortable.***

People not inclined or capable of playing sport would find opportunities in the working economy, music, art, exploring the nature of knowledge in places that could justifiably be called "universities", or in sport administration and reporting/broadcasting. No one should have a meaningless job now that we have robots and artificial intelligence. ***No one would lead a meaningless life.***

No one would get raped, tortured, burned alive, buried alive, genocided or imprisoned in the name of their kings. Jesus Christ would be the king.

Thank you for reading my book. If you have any comments, please send them to dougplumb123@gmail.com

The book is not on any corporate platforms, the only way that I will know if anyone has read (not just downloaded it) it is to get an email.

If you think it is a good and important book, please send the link to friends or post it on social media. It can be found using Yandex.com rather than Google. Google will hide it.

Appendix: Glitches in the Space Time Continuum

Does the world exist as wee see it? In other words, is the knowledge of our physical environment and absolute and simply related to our intuitions of space and time?

When we think of a zero time or an infinite space things do not always add up. I've not seen these examples in Kantian works, only German speaking people have access to full Kantian works and commentary although the quantity and quality of work done in English is immense. It could be that they were unknown at the time.

Example 1 Space: Gabriel's Horn

Any student of first year calculus encounters the problem of convergence and as an example, the example of Gabriel's Horn.

Gabriel's horn is a musical instrument that consists of a horn opening and a very long throat. The throat is such that it slowly reduces in diameter according to the distance one moves from the throat opening along the length of the horn according to the rule 1/ distance. So if I have a horn that has a 1 meter radius at the opening, it has a ½ meter radius at a distance of one meter down along the throat, a radius of 1/3 of a meter at a distance of two meters, ¼ meter radius 3 meters down the throat and goes on and on, without stopping (infinity).

If I wonder how much volume is contained in the horn, I can apply methods learned in a first year calculus class and find that the volume of this horn is a fixed number, a little less than 2/3 cubic meters (2/pi cubic meters).

If I calculate the surface area it is infinite. So if I want to paint this horn, according to this, I would need an infinite amount of paint. It would never matter how thin the coat is, I would always run out of paint.

On the other hand, I could obtain a little less than 2/3 cubic meters of paint, fill up the inside of the horn, then pour some out, leaving a coat of paint on the inside surface. Both calculations, the surface are and the volume can be easily verified to be correct using elementary methods of introductory

calculus. So we have two different answers to the same math question and both are correct. On the one hand, the amount of paint required is infinite, we could never paint the whole horn, on the other hand we only need a little less than 2/3 of a cubic meter of paint to cover the surface area of the horn.

Example 2: Time: Two Capacitor Paradox

A capacitor is a common element found on circuit boards in electronics. There are few electronic devices that do not have capacitors as part of their composition. Capacitors can be found in very high power electronics as well as I.C. chips and semiconductor elements such as transistors and diodes of all kinds.

A capacitor is essentially a battery, practical capacitors don't store a lot of energy, nor for very long which is why they cannot replace batteries. On the other hand they can be very quickly charged and recharged which makes them ideal for electrical circuits where batteries would be too big, expensive and/or slow to charge and discharge. They are an elementary devices in electronics, along with wires, coils and resistors.

A capacitor consists of two plates, each one connected to the circuit. The plates are separated by an insulator. To charge a capacitor, one simply connects it across the terminals of a battery or other electrical power source.

An ideal capacitor can be charged or discharged instantly. Its conducting plates contain no resistance. Practical capacitors contain resistance which prevents the instantaneous charge or discharge.

The physics that describes the action of a capacitor is fully given in a set of equations known as Maxwell's equations and these equations are regarded as an absolute truth in theoretical physics. No observation or experiment can show them to be wrong.

A capacitor stores energy, like a battery when charged and the capacity to store this charge is based on the closeness of its charged plates, the area of the charged plates and the electrical nature of the insulator that lies between them.

A single one farad capacitor holds a charge of one volt with one

coulomb of charge on its plates. It has one joule of energy.

If it is ideal, it can be charged or discharged instantly.

If we use this ideal capacitor to charge another identical and ideal capacitor then the voltage should half across the plates of the capacitors, this according to Maxwell's equations. The charge that is stored in the system cannot change, this too according to Maxwell's equations. Maxwell's Equations used for this example can be reduced to the following formulas:

Energy Stored = ½ * Capacity * Voltage*Voltage

Initially we charge an ideal capacitor of capacity one volt required store a charge of one coulomb – one farad. With a one farad capacitor charged to one volt,

Initial Energy = ½ *Capacity*Voltage*Voltage

= (½)*1*1*1 = **½ joule**

When this capacitor is connected to charge another identical capacitor, the plates of the two different capacitor join to form one bigger capacitor of double the capacity to store a charge over the single one. Because charge is divided, the capacitors are charged to ½ volt. The voltage across the first capacitor cuts in half instantaneously as charge moves between the plates instantaneously.

Closing Energy = ½ * Capacity *Voltage * Voltage

= (½)*(1+1)*(½)*(½) = **¼ joule**

Different total energies result from a lossless charging of the second capacitor. Energy disappears, violating Maxwell's equations and the laws of science. The contradiction can take different forms, assuming that (1) charge is held constant (in this example) or (2) Energy is held constant. Maxwell's require both to be constant.